arXiv:1608.04301v1 [cs.LO] 12 Aug 2016

The Entailment Problem in Modal and Propositional Dependence Logics

Miika Hannula *

August 16, 2016

Abstract

We examine the entailment problem for different modal and propositional dependence logics defined in terms of dependence, independence, or inclusion atoms. We establish numerous new complexity results, and settle a long-standing open question by showing that the validity problem for modal dependence logic is **NEXPTIME**-complete.

1 Introduction

The notions of dependence and independence are pervasive in various fields of science. In physics the time of descent of an object depends only on the height and is independent of the weight; in genetics the sex of humans is determined by the XY-chromosomes; and in social choice theory the societal outcome in any ranked voting system satisfying unanimity and independence of irrelevant alternatives is determined by some single voter. Similar to all examples is that the concepts of dependence and independence arise in the presence of *multitudes* (e.g. events or experiments). Dependence logic is a recent logical formalism which, in contrast to others, has exactly these multitudes as its underlying concept [30]. In this article we study different variants of dependence logic in the propositional and modal logic context. We establish numerous new results on the computational complexity of the associated entailment problems, and settle a long-standing open problem regarding the complexity of validity for modal dependence logic.

Many formal languages (e.g. first-order, propositional, and modal logic) lack the ability to explicitly express dependencies between variables. Dependence logic and its variants address this handicap by extending languages with new dependence atoms $\mathrm{dep}(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ indicating that the value of x_n is functionally determined by the values of $x_1, \ldots, x_{n-1}$. Dependence atoms are evaluated over *teams*, i.e., sets of assignments (or sets of Boolean assignments, worlds of a Kripke model, rows of a database, etc.) which form the basis of *team semantics* [19]. Over the past few years, the area of dependence logic has developed rapidly. In particular, the team semantics of dependence logic has emerged as a novel general semantical framework that allows the combination of various logical formalisms with different dependency notions [7, 9, 22, 20]. We will focus on two specific families of team-based logics: extensions of modal and propositional logic with notions of dependence, independence, and inclusion atoms.

Since its inroduction in 2008 [31], modal dependence logic has been extensively studied. In particular, the expressiveness and computational complexity of modal dependence logic and its variants has

*Department of Computer Science, The University of Auckland, New Zealand. m.hannula@auckland.ac.nz

been almost completely classified [5, 6, 12, 14, 16, 20, 24, 26, 29, 32]. Rather surprisingly however, the complexity of entailment for modal dependence logic has remained a relatively uncharted territory. In contrast, the axiomatic properties of various modal and propositional dependence logics have been examined in depth in the dissertation of Yang [34], and as well in [28]. We will address the current shortage in research by attacking several open questions regarding the complexity of entailment in modal and propositional dependence logics. In addition, we establish new results with respect to their associated validity problems and obtain novel axiomatizations which reflect the obtained complexity bounds. It is worth noting that dependence logic and its variants are not closed under negation which renders their entailment and validity problems genuinely different.

For the original first-order dependence logic the validity problem has already non-arithmetical complexity, and hence no complete effective axiomatization exists. However, the first-order consequences of dependence logic sentences have been axiomatized [21], and this axiomatization has been extended to independence logic as well [10, 33]. For modal and propositional dependence logics the picture is obviously different. Virtema showed in [32] that the validity problem is **NEXPTIME**-complete for propositional dependence logic and conjectured a higher complexity for modal dependence logic. Somewhat surprisingly, we answer Virtema's conjecture in the negative by proving **NEXPTIME**-completeness for validity of modal dependence logic; this result applies also to the so-called extended modal dependence logic that extends the scope of dependence atoms to arbitrary modal formulae. Furthermore, we show that the entailment problem for (extended) modal dependence and propositional dependence logics is complete for $\mathbf{co\text{-}NEXPTIME^{NP}}$. We also consider modal logic extended with so-called intuitionistic disjunction and show that the associated entailment, validity, and satisfiability problems are all **PSPACE**-complete. The obtained results have interesting consequences. First, combining results from [29, 32] we notice that the complexity of validity and satisfiability coincide for (extended) modal dependence logic. Secondly, combining results from [5, 6, 29, 32] we notice that (extended) modal dependence and propositional dependence logic correspond to one another in terms of the complexity of their validity, entailment, and model checking problems; the only difference is that satisfiability of propositional dependence logic has lower complexity than that of its modal counterpart (**NP**-complete vs. **NEXPTIME**-complete, resp. [24, 29]). In contrast, the standard propositional and modal logic differ from another both in terms of their satisfiability and validity problems (**NP**-complete/**co-NP**-complete vs. **PSPACE**-complete, resp. [4, 23]).

We also establish exact complexity bounds for entailment and validity of quantified propositional independence and inclusion logics, that are, logical formalisms extending propositional logic with quantifiers and either independence or inclusion atoms [11]. These results are obtained by investigating recent generalizations of the quantified Boolean formula problem. We show that the validity and entailment problems are both $\mathbf{co\text{-}NEXPTIME^{NP}}$-complete for quantified propositional independence logic and that the latter is **co-NEXPTIME**-complete for quantified propositional inclusion logic. These results also imply the same lower bounds for the corresponding modal independence and inclusion logic. Hence, we obtain that validity is harder for modal independence logic than it is for modal dependence logic (unless the exponential-time hierarchy collapses at a low level), although in terms of satisfiability both logics are **NEXPTIME**-complete [20].

Lastly, we note that the entailment problem has been extensively studied in database theory (where it is called the implication problem) in connection with functional, embedded multivalued, and inclusion dependencies. These dependencies, when defined over relational databases, correspond respectively to our dependence, independence, and inclusion atoms. In contrast to the modal logic context, the entailment problem for inclusion dependencies is much harder that that for functional dependencies (**PSPACE**-complete vs. linear time decidable [2, 1]), and for embedded multivalued dependencies the problem is even undecidable [17].

Organization. This article is organized as follows. In Section 2 we present basic properties of modal and (quantified) propositional dependence logics, and give background for the proof techniques used in the paper. In Sections 3, 4, and 5 we consider entailment in modal and propositional dependence, independence, and inclusion logic, respectively. In Section 6 we introduce novel sound and complete axiomizations for (quantified) propositional dependence logic and extended modal dependence logic, based on our observations on their associated entailment problems. In Section 7 we conclude the paper with a summary.

2 Preliminaries

We assume that the reader is familiar with the basic concepts of propositional and modal logic, as well as those of computational complexity. Let us note at this point that all the hardness results in the paper are stated under polynomial-time reductions.

Notation. Following the common convention for team-based logics we assume that all our formulae appear in negation normal form (NNF). We use $p, q, r, \ldots$ to denote propositional variables. For two sequences $\overline{a}$ and $\overline{b}$, we write $\overline{a}\overline{b}$ to denote their concatenation. For a function f and a sequence $(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ of elements from the domain of f, we denote by $f(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ the sequence $(f(a_1), \ldots, f(a_n))$. Let ϕ and ψ be any formulae. Then $\mathsf{Var}(\phi)$ refers to the set of variables appearing in ϕ, and $\mathsf{Fr}(\phi)$ to the set of free variables appearing in ϕ, both defined in the standard way. We sometimes write $\phi(p_1, \ldots, p_n)$ instead of ϕ to emphasize that $\mathsf{Fr}(\phi) = \{p_1, \ldots, p_n\}$. For a variable p, we write $\phi(\psi/p)$ to denote the formula obtained from ϕ by substituting ψ for all free appeareances of p. For a subformula ϕ_0 of ϕ and a formula θ, we write $\phi(\theta/\phi_0)$ to denote the formula obtained from ϕ by substituting θ for ϕ_0. We use $\phi^{\perp}$ to denote the NNF formula obtained from $\neg\phi$ by pushing the negation to the atomic level, and sometimes $\phi^{\top}$ to denote ϕ.

2.1 Propositional Dependence Logics

The syntax of *quantified propositional logic* (QPL) is generated by the following grammar:

$$\phi ::= p \mid \neg p \mid (\phi \wedge \phi) \mid (\phi \vee \phi) \mid \exists p\phi \mid \forall p\phi. \tag{1}$$

The formulae of QPL are evaluated against teams, i.e., sets of assignments. Let V be a set of variables. We say that a function $s\colon V \to \{0,1\}$ is a *(propositional) assignment* over V. A *(propositional) team* X over V is a then set of propositional assignments over V. Let s and x be an assignment and a team over V. We denote by $s(a/x)$ the assignment over $V \cup \{x\}$ that agrees with s everywhere, except that it maps x to a. The *restriction* of s to variables in $W \subseteq V$ is denoted by $s \upharpoonright W$, and by $X \upharpoonright W$ we denote the team $\{s \upharpoonright W \mid s \in X\}$. The quantification of propositional variables is defined in terms of *duplication teams* $X[\{0,1\}/p] := \{s(a/p) \mid s \in X, a \in \{0,1\}\}$ where p is a propositional variable; and *supplementation teams* $X[F/p] := \{s(a/x) \mid s \in X, a \in F(s)\}$ where F is a mapping from X into $\{\{0\},\{1\},\{0,1\}\}$. Next we present the team semantics of QPL.

Definition 1 (Team Semantics of QPL)**.** Let $\phi \in$ QPL and let X be a propositional team over a set

$V \supseteq \mathsf{Fr}(\phi)$ of propositional variables. The satisfaction relation $X \models \phi$ is defined as follows:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} X \models p & \Leftrightarrow & \forall s \in X : s(p) = 1, \\ X \models \neg p & \Leftrightarrow & \forall s \in X : s(p) = 1, \\ X \models \phi_1 \wedge \phi_2 & \Leftrightarrow & X \models \phi_1 \text{ and } X \models \phi_2, \\ X \models \phi_1 \vee \phi_2 & \Leftrightarrow & \exists Y, Z : Y \cup Z = X, Y \models \phi_1, \text{ and } Z \models \phi_2, \\ X \models \exists p \phi & \Leftrightarrow & \exists F \in {}^{X}\{\{0\},\{1\},\{0,1\}\} : X[F/p] \models \phi, \\ X \models \forall p \phi & \Leftrightarrow & X[\{0,1\}/p] \models \phi. \end{array}$$

Team semantics can be seen as a wider semantical framework that enables extending standard logical formalisms with various dependency notions. These extensions are usually conservative as highlighted in the propositional setting by the following proposition. Note that by $\models_{\mathsf{PL}}$ we denote the usual satisfaction relation of propositional logic. The proofs of the following proposition and Propositions 3 and 4 proceed as their analogues in the first-order dependence logic context in [30].

Proposition 2 (Flatness [30])**.** *Let ϕ be a formula in* QPL*, and let X be a team over $V \supseteq \mathsf{Fr}(\phi)$. Then:*

$$X \models \phi \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \forall s \in X : s \models_{\mathsf{PL}} \phi.$$

We will investigate variants of QPL that arise from three different dependency notions, dependence, independence, and inclusion atoms. Let $\overline{p}$ be a sequence of propositional variables, and let q be a single propositional variable. Then $\mathrm{dep}(\overline{p}, q)$ is a *propositional dependence atom* with the following team semantics:

$$X \models \mathrm{dep}(p_1, \ldots, p_n) \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \forall s, s' \in X : s(\overline{p}) = s'(\overline{p}) \text{ implies } s(q) = s'(q).$$

Let $\overline{p}$, $\overline{q}$, $\overline{r}$ be sequences of propositional variables. Then $\overline{p} \perp_{\overline{r}} \overline{q}$ is a *propositional independence atom* with the following team semantics:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} X \models \overline{p} \perp_{\overline{r}} \overline{q} & \Leftrightarrow & \forall s, s' \in X : s(\overline{p}) = s'(\overline{p}) \text{ implies } \exists s'' \in X : s(\overline{pq}) = s''(\overline{pq}) \text{ and} \\ & & s(\overline{r}) = s''(\overline{r}). \end{array}$$

Let $\overline{p}$ and $\overline{q}$ be two sequences of propositional variables that share the same length. Then $\overline{p} \subseteq \overline{q}$ is a *propositional inclusion atom* with the following team semantics:

$$X \models \overline{p} \subseteq \overline{q} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \forall s \in X \; \exists s' \in X : s(\overline{p}) = s'(\overline{q}).$$

Quantified propositional dependence logic (QPDL) is obtained by extending QPL with propositional dependence atoms. Similarly, we define *quantified propositional independence logic* (QPLInd) and *quantified propositional inclusion logic* (QPLInc) as the extensions of QPL with propositional independence or inclusion atoms, respectively. By dropping the quantifiers $\exists$ and $\forall$ from the syntax we obtain the standard propositional logic and its extensions with different dependency notions. Let us hence denote by PL, PDL, PLInd, PLInc the quantifier-free fragments of QPL, QPDL, QPLInd, QPLInc, respectively.

In addition to the aforenementioned dependency notions we examine so-called *intuituionistic disjunction* $\otimes$ defined as follows:

$$X \models \phi_1 \otimes \phi_2 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad X \models \phi_1 \text{ or } X \models \phi_2. \tag{2}$$

QPL and PL extended with intuitionistic disjunction are denoted by QPL($\otimes$) and PL($\otimes$).

QPDL and QPL($\otimes$), as well as their analogues in the first-order and modal setting, enjoy the following downward closure property.

Proposition 3 (Downward Closure [30])**.** *Let ϕ be a formula in* QPL *or* QPL($\mathbin{⫽}$)*, and let X be a team over a set $V \supseteq \mathsf{Fr}(\phi)$ of propositional variables. Then:*

$$Y \subseteq X \text{ and } X \models \phi \quad \Rightarrow \quad Y \models \phi.$$

Notice that inclusion atoms and independence atoms do not satisfy downward closure. However, one imporant feature is shared by almost all team-based logics that express dependencies by new atomic formulae: the satisfaction of a formula depends only on the values of the variables that appear free in it. This seemingly innocent statement is violated, e.g., in independence-friendly logic, a logic that corresponds to dependence logic in expressive power but describes dependence via manipulation of the quantifiers and connectives [18].

Proposition 4 (Locality [30])**.** *Let ϕ be a formula in* QPL*, let X be a team over a set $V \supseteq \mathsf{Fr}(\phi)$, and let $V' \subseteq V$. Then:*

$$X \models \phi \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad X \upharpoonright V' \models \phi.$$

2.2 Modal Dependence Logics

The syntax of *modal logic* (ML) is generated by the following grammar:

$$\phi ::= p \mid \neg p \mid (\phi \wedge \phi) \mid (\phi \vee \phi) \mid \Box\phi \mid \Diamond\phi. \tag{3}$$

Extensions of modal logic with different dependency notions are made possible via a generalization of the standard Kripke semantics by teams, here defined as sets of worlds. A *Kripke model* over a set of variables V is a sequence $\mathcal{M} = (W, R, \pi)$ where W is a non-empty set of worlds, R is a binary relation over W, and $\pi\colon V \to \mathcal{P}(W)$ is a function that associates each variable with a set of worlds. A *team* T of a Kripke model $\mathcal{M} = (W, R, \pi)$ is a now subset of W. For the team semantics of modal operators we define the set of successors of a team T as $R[T] := \{w \in W \mid \exists w' \in T : (w', w) \in R\}$ and the set of legal successor teams of a team T as $R\langle T\rangle := \{T' \subseteq R[T] \mid \forall w \in T\ \exists w' \in T' : (w, w') \in R\}$. The team semantics of modal logic is now defined as follows.

Definition 5 (Team Semantics of ML)**.** Let ϕ be a ML formula, let $\mathcal{M} = (W, R, \pi)$ be a Kripke model over $V \supseteq \mathsf{Var}(\phi)$, and let $T \subseteq W$. The satisfaction relation $\mathcal{M}, T \models \phi$ is defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{M}, T \models p &\quad\Leftrightarrow\quad T \subseteq \pi(p),\\
\mathcal{M}, T \models \neg p &\quad\Leftrightarrow\quad T \cap \pi(p) = \emptyset,\\
\mathcal{M}, T \models \phi_1 \wedge \phi_2 &\quad\Leftrightarrow\quad \mathcal{M}, T \models \phi_1 \text{ and } \mathcal{M}, T \models \phi_2,\\
\mathcal{M}, T \models \phi_1 \vee \phi_2 &\quad\Leftrightarrow\quad \exists T_1, T_2 : T_1 \cup T_2 = T, \mathcal{M}, T_1 \models \phi_1, \text{ and } \mathcal{M}, T_2 \models \phi_2,\\
\mathcal{M}, T \models \Diamond\phi &\quad\Leftrightarrow\quad \exists T' \in R\langle T\rangle : \mathcal{M}, T' \models \phi,\\
\mathcal{M}, T \models \Box\phi &\quad\Leftrightarrow\quad \mathcal{M}, R[T] \models \phi.
\end{aligned}$$

For a set of formulae $\Sigma \cup \{\phi\}$, we write $\Sigma \models \phi$ to denote that Σ implies ϕ according to the team semantics. By replacing $\models$ with $\models_{\mathsf{PL}}$ or $\models_{\mathsf{ML}}$ we refer to logical consequence in terms of the standard propositional or modal logic semantics, respectively. We also write $\phi \equiv \psi$ to denote that ϕ and ψ are two equivalent formulae under the team semantics.

The analogue of Proposition 2 holds also for modal logic. Let us denote by $\models_{\mathsf{ML}}$ the usual satisfaction relation of modal logic.

Proposition 6 (Flatness [29])**.** *Let ϕ be a formula in* ML*, let $\mathcal{M} = (W, R, \pi)$ be a Kripke model over $V \supseteq \mathsf{Var}(\phi)$, and let $T \subseteq W$ be a team. Then:*

$$\mathcal{M}, T \models \phi \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \forall w \in T : \mathcal{M}, w \models_{\mathsf{ML}} \phi.$$

The syntaxes of modal dependence, independence, and inclusion logics (MDL, MLInd, and MLInc, resp.) are obtained by extending the syntax of ML by propositional dependence, independence, or inclusion atoms, respectively. The syntax of extended modal dependence logic (EMDL) is obtained by extending the syntax of ML with *modal dependence atoms* $\mathrm{dep}(\overline{\phi}, \psi)$ where $\overline{\phi}$ is a sequence of ML formulae and ψ a single ML formula. For the team semantics of the aforenementioned atoms we define a mapping from Kripke models and teams to propositional teams. For a set of variables V, denote by $\mathsf{ML}(V)$ the set of all ML formulae over V. For a world w of a Kripke model $\mathcal{M}$ over V, define $s_{\mathcal{M},w} \colon \{p_\phi \mid \phi \in \mathsf{ML}(V)\} \to \{0, 1\}$ as the assignment

$$s_{\mathcal{M},w}(p_\phi) \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \mathcal{M}, w \models \phi, \\ 0 & \text{if } \mathcal{M}, w \not\models \phi. \end{cases}$$

For a team T of $\mathcal{M}$, we then let $X_{\mathcal{M},T} := \{s_{\mathcal{M},w} \mid w \in T\}$. The satisfaction relation $\mathcal{M}, T \models \theta$ for propositional dependence, independence, and inclusion atoms, as well as modal dependence atoms, is now defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{M}, T \models \theta \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad X_{\mathcal{M},T} \models \theta.$$

For the sake of our proof arguments, we also extend ML with predicates. The syntax of *relational modal logic* RML extends the syntax of ML with relational atoms $S(\phi_1, \ldots, \phi_n)$ where $\phi_1, \ldots, \phi_n$ are ML formulae. The formulae of RML are evaluated over *relational Kripke models* $\mathcal{M} = (W, R, \pi, S_1^{\mathcal{M}}, \ldots, S_n^{\mathcal{M}})$ where each $S_i^{\mathcal{M}}$ is a set of binary sequences of length $\#S_i$, that is, the arity of the relation symbol S_i. Let us denote by $\mathcal{M}, w \models_{\mathsf{RML}} \phi$ the extension of the standard Kripke semantics to relational and negated relational atoms as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}, w \models S(\phi_1, \ldots, \phi_n) \quad &\Leftrightarrow \quad (s_{\mathcal{M},w}(p_{\phi_1}), \ldots, s_{\mathcal{M},w}(p_{\phi_n})) \in S^{\mathcal{M}}, \\ \mathcal{M}, w \models \neg S(\phi_1, \ldots, \phi_n) \quad &\Leftrightarrow \quad (s_{\mathcal{M},w}(p_{\phi_1}), \ldots, s_{\mathcal{M},w}(p_{\phi_n})) \notin S^{\mathcal{M}}. \end{aligned}$$

Lastly, we denote the extension of ML with intuitionistic disjunction $\otimes$ by $\mathsf{ML}(\otimes)$. The semantics of $\otimes$ in the modal context is defined analogously to (2). We conclude this section by stating the downward closure property for modal logic extended with dependence atoms and intuitionistic disjunctions.

Proposition 7 (Downward Closure [5, 31, 34])**.** *Let ϕ be a formula in* MDL*,* EMDL*, or* $\mathsf{ML}(\otimes)$*, let $\mathcal{M} = (W, R, \pi)$ be a Kripke model over $V \supseteq \mathsf{Var}(\phi)$, and let $T \subseteq W$ be a team. Then:*

$$T' \subseteq T \text{ and } \mathcal{M}, T \models \phi \quad \Rightarrow \quad \mathcal{M}, T' \models \phi.$$

2.3 Generalized Quantified Boolean Formulae

Next we introduce a recent generalization of the quantified Boolean formula problem, the standard **PSPACE**-complete problem. These generalizations will be later used to show several lower bound results for the entailment problems of various propositional and modal dependence logics. A quantified Boolean formula (QBF) is a quantified propositional formula of the form

$$Q_1 p_1 \ldots Q_n p_n \theta \tag{4}$$

where θ is quantifier-free and contains only variables from $\{p_1, \ldots, p_n\}$. The quantified Boolean formula problem, which is to decide whether a formula of the form (4) is true or not, can be generalized to characterize $\mathbf{NEXPTIME}$ by adding auxiliary constraints for existential quantification. From the team semantics perspective this basically amounts to extending the quantifier-free part of (4) with fresh dependence atoms. Let us call a QBF instance of the form

$$\forall p_1 \ldots \forall p_n \exists q_1 \ldots \exists q_m \theta. \tag{5}$$

simple. A *constraint* $\mathcal{C}$ of a simple QBF ϕ of the form (5) is a sequence $(\overline{c}_1, \ldots, \overline{c}_m)$ where each $\overline{c}_i$ is a sequence of variables from $\{p_1, \ldots, p_n\}$. Intuitively, a constraint $\overline{c}_i$ indicates that the selection of q_i may depend only on the values of the variables listed in $\overline{c}_i$. A pair $(\phi, \mathcal{C})$, where ϕ is a simple QBF instance with a constraint $\mathcal{C}$, is called a *dependency quantified Boolean formula* (DQBF). A DQBF $(\phi, \mathcal{C})$, where ϕ is of the form (5) and $\mathcal{C} = (\overline{c}_1, \ldots, \overline{c}_m)$, is said to be *true* if there are functions $f_i \colon \{0,1\}^{|\overline{c}_i|} \to \{0,1\}$ such that $s(f(s(\overline{c}_1))/q_1, \ldots, f(s(\overline{c}_m))/q_m)$ satisfies θ for all assignments $s \colon \{p_1, \ldots, p_n\} \to \{0,1\}$. The problem of determining the truth value of a given DQBF instance is $\mathbf{NEXPTIME}$-complete [27]. Recently [11] introduced a generalization of the DQBF problem in terms of alternating Skolem function quantification.

Definition 8. A Σ_k*-alternating dependency quantified Boolean formula* (Σ_k-ADQBF) is a pair $(\phi, \mathcal{C})$ where ϕ is an expression of the form

$$\phi := \forall p_1 \ldots \forall p_n \, (\exists q_1^1 \ldots \exists q_{j_1}^1) \, (\mathsf{U}\, q_1^2 \ldots \mathsf{U}\, q_{j_2}^2) \, (\exists q_1^3 \ldots \exists q_{j_3}^3) \;\ldots\; (\, Q q_1^k \ldots Q q_{j_k}^k) \, \theta,$$

where $Q \in \{\exists, \mathsf{U}\}$ and θ is a quantifier-free propositional formula in which only the quantified variables may appear, and $\mathcal{C}$ is a sequence $(\overline{c}_1^1, \ldots, \overline{c}_{j_k}^k)$ whose members are sequences of variables from $\{p_1, \ldots, p_n\}$. Analogously, a Π_k*-alternating dependency quantified Boolean formula* (Π_k-ADQBF) is a pair $(\phi, \mathcal{C})$ where ϕ is an expression of the form

$$\phi := \forall p_1 \ldots \forall p_n \, (\mathsf{U}\, q_1^1 \ldots \mathsf{U}\, q_{j_1}^1) \, (\exists q_1^2 \ldots \exists q_{j_2}^2) \, (\mathsf{U}\, q_1^3 \ldots \mathsf{U}\, q_{j_3}^3) \;\ldots\; (\, Q q_1^k \ldots Q q_{j_k}^k) \, \theta.$$

The sequence $\mathcal{C}$ is called the *constraint* of ϕ.

The truth value of a Σ_k-ADQBF or a Π_k-ADQBF instance is determined by interpreting each $\mathsf{U}\, q_i^l$ as universal quantification over Skolem functions $f_i^l \colon \{0,1\}^{|\overline{c}_i^l|} \to \{0,1\}$. Let us denote the associated decision problems by $\mathrm{TRUE}(\Sigma_k\text{-ADQBF})$ and $\mathrm{TRUE}(\Pi_k\text{-ADQBF})$. Using these and alternating Turing machines (see [3]) we conclude this section with two theorems describing the complexity of the exponential hierarchy. Notice that Σ_k^{E} and Π_k^{E} denote the kth levels of the exponential hierarchy, defined by $\Sigma_0^{\mathrm{E}} := \Pi_0^{\mathrm{E}} := \mathbf{EXPTIME}$, and for $k \geq 1$ recursively by $\Sigma_k^{\mathrm{E}} := \mathbf{NEXPTIME}^{\Sigma_{k-1}^{\mathrm{P}}}$ and $\Pi_k^{\mathrm{E}} := \textbf{co-}\mathbf{NEXPTIME}^{\Sigma_{k-1}^{\mathrm{P}}}$. Recall that $\Sigma_0^{\mathrm{P}} := \Pi_0^{\mathrm{P}} := \mathbf{P}$, and for $k \geq 1$, $\Sigma_k^{\mathrm{P}} := \mathbf{NP}^{\Sigma_{k-1}^{\mathrm{P}}}$ and $\Pi_k^{\mathrm{P}} := \textbf{co-}\mathbf{NP}^{\Sigma_{k-1}^{\mathrm{P}}}$.

Theorem 9 ([11])**.** *Let $k \geq 1$. For odd k the problem $\mathrm{TRUE}(\Sigma_k\text{-ADQBF})$ is Σ_k^{E}-complete. For even k the problem $\mathrm{TRUE}(\Pi_k\text{-ADQBF})$ is Π_k^{E}-complete.*

Theorem 10 ([3, 25])**.** *Σ_k^{E} (or Π_k^{E}) is the class of problems recognizable in exponential time by an alternating Turing machine which starts in an existential (universal) state and alternates at most $k-1$ many times.*

2.4 From Quantified Propositional to Modal Logics

In this section we show how to generate simple polynomial-time reductions from quantified propositional dependence logics to modal dependence logics with respect to their entailment and validity problem. First we present Lemma 11 which is a direct consequence of [8, Lemma 14] that presents prenex normal form translations in the first-order dependence logic setting over structures with universe size at least 2. The result follows by the obvious first-order interpretation of quantified propositional formulae: satisfaction of a quantified propositional formula ϕ by a binary team X can be replaced with satisfaction of ϕ^* by $\mathcal{M} := (\{0,1\}, t^{\mathcal{M}} := 1, f^{\mathcal{M}} := 0)$ and X, where ϕ^* is a formula obtained from ϕ by replacing atomic propositional formulae p and $\neg p$ respectively with $p = t$ and $p = f$.

Lemma 11 ([8])**.** *Any formula ϕ in L, where $\mathsf{L} \in \{\mathsf{QPDL}, \mathsf{QPLInc}, \mathsf{QPLInd}\}$, is logically equivalent to a polynomial size formula $Q_1 p_1 \dots Q_n p_n \psi$ in L where ψ is quantifier-free and $Q_i \in \{\exists, \forall\}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$.*

Next we show how to describe in modal terms a quantifier block $Q_1 p_1 \dots Q_n p_n$. Using the standard method in modal logic we construct a formula $\mathsf{tree}(V, p, n)$ that enforces the complete binary assignment tree over $p_1, \dots, p_n$ for a team over V [23]. The formulation of $\mathsf{tree}(V, p, n)$ follows [11]. We define $\mathsf{store}_n(p) := (p \wedge \Box^n p) \vee (\neg p \wedge \Box^n \neg p)$, where $\Box^n$ is a shorthand for $\overbrace{\Box \cdots \Box}^{n \text{ many}}$, to impose the existing values for p to successors in the tree. We also define $\mathsf{branch}_n(p) := \Diamond p \wedge \Diamond \neg p \wedge \Box \mathsf{store}_n(p)$ to indicate that there are ≥ 2 successor states which disagree on the variable p and that all successor states preserve their values up to branches of length n. Then we let

$$\mathsf{tree}(V, p, n) := \bigwedge_{q \in V} \bigwedge_{i=1}^{n} \mathsf{store}_n(q) \wedge \bigwedge_{i=0}^{n-1} \Box^i \mathsf{branch}_{n-(i+1)}(p_{i+1}).$$

Notice that $\mathsf{tree}(V, p, n)$ is an ML-formula and hence has the flatness property by Proposition 6.

Theorem 12. *The entailment (or validity) problems for* QPDL, QPLInc, QPLInd *are polynomial-time reducible to the entailment (validity) problems for* MDL, MLInc, MLInd, *respectively.*

Proof. Consider first the entailment problem, and assume that $\Sigma \cup \{\phi\}$ is a finite set of formulae in either QPDL, QPLInd, or QPLInc}. By Lemma 11 each formula in $\theta \in \Sigma \cup \{\phi\}$ can transformed in polynomial time to the form $\theta_0 = Q_1 p_1 \dots Q_n p_n \psi$ where ψ is quantifier-free. Moreover, by locality principle (Proposition 4) we may assume that the variable sequences $p_1, \dots, p_n$ corresponding to these quantifier blocks are initial segments of a shared infinite list $p_1, p_2, p_3, \dots$ of variables. Assume m is the maximal length of the quantifier blocks that appear in any of the translations, and let V be the set of variables that appear free in some of them. W.l.o.g. we may assume that $\{p_1, \dots, p_m\}$ and V are disjoint. We let θ_1 be obtained from θ_0 by replacing quantifiers $\exists$ and $\forall$ respectively with $\Diamond$ and $\Box$. It follows that $\Sigma \models \phi$ iff $\{\theta_1 \mid \theta \in \Sigma\} \cup \{\mathsf{tree}(V, p, n)\} \models \phi_1$. [1] For the validity problem, assume that Σ is empty. Then $\models \phi$ iff $\models \mathsf{tree}(V, p, n) \vee (\mathsf{tree}(V, p, n) \wedge \phi_1)$. Since the reductions are clearly polynomial, this concludes the proof. □

3 Entailment in Modal and Propositional Dependence Logics

In this section we consider the entailment problem for modal and (quantified) propositional logics. By the result of Virtema we already have the following lower bound for the associated validity problems.

[1] Notice that the direction from left to right does not hold under the so-called strict team semantics where $\exists$ and $\Diamond$ range over individuals. These two logics are not downwards closed and the modal translation does not prevent the complete binary tree of having two distinct roots that agree on the variables in V.

Theorem 13 ([32])**.** *The validity problem for* PDL *is* **NEXPTIME***-complete, and for* MDL *and* EMDL *it is* **NEXPTIME***-hard.*

This result was shown by a reduction from the dependency quantified Boolean formula problem to the validity problem of PDL. The following lemma uses essentially the same technique to reduce from $\mathrm{TRUE}(\Pi_2\text{-ADQBF})$ to the entailment problem of PDL.

Lemma 14. *The entailment problem for* PDL *is* **co-NEXPTIME$^{\mathbf{NP}}$***-hard.*

Proof. We show a reduction from $\mathrm{TRUE}(\Pi_2\text{-ADQBF})$ which is Π_2^{E}-complete by Theorem 9. Let $(\phi, \mathcal{C})$ be an instance of Π_2-ADQBF in which case ϕ is of the form

$$\forall p_1 \ldots \forall p_n \mathsf{U}\, q_1 \ldots \mathsf{U}\, q_m \exists q_{m+1} \ldots \exists q_{m+m'} \theta$$

and $\mathcal{C}$ lists tuples $\overline{c}_i \subseteq \{p_1, \ldots, p_n\}$, for $i = 1, \ldots, m+m'$. Define $\Sigma := \{\mathrm{dep}(\overline{c}_i, q_i) \mid i = 1, \ldots, n\}$ and let

$$\psi := \theta \vee \bigvee_{i=m+1}^{m+m'} \mathrm{dep}(\overline{c}_i, q_i)\,.$$

Clearly, Σ and ψ can be constructed from $(\phi, \mathcal{C})$ in polynomial time. It suffices to show that $\Sigma \models \psi$ iff ϕ is true.

Assume first that $\Sigma \models \psi$ and let $f_i \colon \{0,1\}^{|\overline{c}_i|} \to \{0,1\}$ be arbitrary for $i = 1, \ldots, m$. Construct a team X that consists of all assignments s that map $p_1, \ldots, p_n, q_{m+1}, \ldots, q_{m+m'}$ into $\{0,1\}$ and $q_1, \ldots, q_m$ respectively to $f_1(s(\overline{c}_1)), \ldots, f_m(s(\overline{c}_m))$. Since $X \models \Sigma$ we find $Z, Y_1, \ldots, Y_{m'} \subseteq X$ such that $Z \cup Y_1 \cup \ldots \cup Y_{m'} = X$, $Z \models \theta$, and $Y_i \models \mathrm{dep}(\overline{c}_{m+i}, q_{m+i})$ for $i = 1, \ldots, m'$. We may assume that each Y_i is a maximal subset satisfying $\mathrm{dep}(\overline{c}_{m+i}, q_{m+i})$, i.e., for all $s \in X \setminus Y_i$, $Y_i \cup \{s\} \not\models \mathrm{dep}(\overline{c}_{m+i}, q_{m+i})$. By downward closure (Proposition 3) we may assume that Z does not intersect any of the subsets $Y_1, \ldots, Y_{m'}$. It follows that there are functions $f_i \colon \{0,1\}^{|\overline{c}_i|} \to \{0,1\}$, for $i = m+1, \ldots, m+m'$, such that

$$Z = \{s\big(f_{m+1}(s(\overline{c}_{m+1}))/q_{m+1}, \ldots, f_{m+m'}(s(\overline{c}_{m+m'}))/q_{m+m'}\big) \mid s \in X\}.$$

Notice that Z is maximal with respect to $p_1, \ldots, p_n$, i.e., $Z \upharpoonright \{p_1, \ldots, p_n\} = {}^{\{p_1, \ldots, p_n\}}\{0,1\}$. Hence, by the flatness property (Proposition 2), and since $Z \models \theta$, it follows that θ holds for all values of $p_1, \ldots, p_n$ and for the values of $q_1, \ldots, q_{m+m'}$ chosen respectively according to $f_1, \ldots, f_{m+m'}$. Therefore, ϕ is true which shows the direction from left to right.

Assume then that ϕ is true, and let X be a team satisfying Σ. Then there are functions $f_i \colon \{0,1\}^{|\overline{c}_i|} \to \{0,1\}$ such that $f(s(\overline{c}_i)) = s(q_i)$ for $s \in X$ and $i = 1, \ldots, m$. Since ϕ is true we find functions $f_i \colon \{0,1\}^{|\overline{c}_i|} \to \{0,1\}$, for $i = m+1, \ldots, m+m'$, such that

$$\forall s \in X : s[f_{m+1}(s(\overline{c}_{m+1}))/q_{m+1}, \ldots, f_{m+m'}(s(\overline{c}_{m+m'}))/q_{m+m'}] \models \theta. \tag{6}$$

Clearly, $Y_i := \{s \in X \mid s(q_i) \neq f(s(\overline{c}_i))\}$ satisfies $\mathrm{dep}(\overline{c}_i, q_i)$ for $i = m+1, \ldots, m+m'$. Then it follows by (6) and flatness (Proposition 2) that $X \setminus (Y_{m+1} \cup \ldots \cup Y_{m+m'})$ satisfies θ. Therefore, $\Sigma \models \psi$ which concludes the direction from right to left. □

Next we show in Lemmata 16, 17, and 18 that **co-NEXPTIME$^{\mathbf{NP}}$** is also the upper bound for the entailment problem of EMDL. Let $\overline{\alpha}\beta$ be a sequence of formulae where $\overline{\alpha} := (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n)$, and let f be a function $\{\top, \bot\}^n \to \{\top, \bot\}$. Then we define

$$D(f, \overline{\alpha}, \beta) := \bigvee_{a_1, \ldots, a_n \in \{\top, \bot\}} \alpha_1^{a_1} \wedge \ldots \alpha_n^{a_n} \wedge \beta^{f(a_1, \ldots, a_n)}. \tag{7}$$

The equivalence

$$\mathrm{dep}(\overline{\alpha},\beta) \equiv \bigotimes_{f\colon \{\top,\bot\}^n\to\{\top,\bot\}} D(f,\overline{\alpha},\beta) \tag{8}$$

has been noticed in the contexts of MDL and EMDL respectively in [31, 5]. Our proof uses this observation and relates to the standard **PSPACE** algorithm for ML satisfiability [23]. However, we wish to avoid the exponential blow-up involved in both (7) and (8). Instead, EMDL entailment is interpreted using succint RML formulae whose relations are obtained from universal/existential guessing. We will hence utilize the equivalence

$$(W,R,\pi) \models_{\mathsf{ML}} D(f,\overline{\alpha},\beta) \Leftrightarrow (W,R,\pi,S) \models_{\mathsf{RML}} S(\overline{\alpha}\beta), \tag{9}$$

where $S := \{(\alpha_1,\ldots,\alpha_n,\beta) \in \{0,1\}^{n+1} \mid f(\alpha_1,\ldots,\alpha_n) = \beta\}$.

For Lemma 16 we need the following simple proposition, based on [32, 34] where the statement has been proven for empty Σ.

Proposition 15. *Let Σ be a set of $\mathcal{L}$ formulae, and let $\phi,\psi \in \mathcal{L}(\otimes)$ where $\mathcal{L} \in \{\mathsf{PL},\mathsf{QPL},\mathsf{ML}\}$. Then $\Sigma \models \phi_0 \otimes \phi_1$ iff $\Sigma \models \phi_0$ or $\Sigma \models \phi_1$.*

Proof. It suffices to show the direction from right to left. Assume first that $\mathcal{L} = \mathsf{ML}$, and let $\mathcal{M}_0, T_0$ and $\mathcal{M}_1, T_1$ be counterexamples to $\Sigma \models \phi_0$ and $\Sigma \models \phi_1$, respectively. W.l.o.g. we may assume that $\mathcal{M}_0$ and $\mathcal{M}_1$ are disjoint. Since the truth value of a $\mathsf{ML}(\otimes)$ formula is preserved under taking disjoint unions of Kripke models (see Theorem 6.1.9. in [34], also Proposition 2.13. in [32]) we obtain that $\mathcal{M}, T_0 \models \Sigma \cup \{\sim\phi_0\}$ and $\mathcal{M}, T_1 \models \Sigma \cup \{\sim\phi_1\}$ for $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_0 \cup \mathcal{M}_1$. By the downward closure property of $\mathsf{ML}(\otimes)$ (Proposition 7), and by the flatness property of ML (Proposition 6), we then obtain that $\mathcal{M}, T \models \Sigma \cup \{\sim\phi_0, \sim\phi_1\}$ where $T = T_0 \cup T_1$. This shows the claim for $\mathcal{L} = \mathsf{ML}$. The other two cases are analogous, expect that there is no need to consider disjoint propositional teams. □

Lemma 16 constitutes the basis for our alternating exponential-time algorithm. Notice that we refer by $\sim$ to the classical negation: $\mathcal{M}, x \models \sim\phi :\Leftrightarrow \mathcal{M}, x \not\models \phi$, where x is a team or a world.

Lemma 16. *Let $\mathcal{L} \in \{\mathsf{PDL},\mathsf{QPDL},\mathsf{EMDL}\}$, and let $\phi_1,\ldots,\phi_n$ be formulae in $\mathcal{L}$. Let*

$$\overline{d}_i = \left(\phi_{i_1} := \mathrm{dep}(\overline{\alpha}_{i_1},\beta_{i_{m_1}}), \ldots, \phi_{i_{m_i}} := \mathrm{dep}(\overline{\alpha}_{i_{m_i}},\beta_{i_{m_i}})\right)$$

list all dependence atom subformulae (including repetitions) of ϕ_i, for $i = 1,\ldots,n$. Then $\{\phi_1,\ldots,\phi_{n-1}\} \models \phi_n$ iff for all sequences $f_{1_1},\ldots,f_{n-1_{m_{n-1}}}$, where f_{i_j} is a function from $\{\top,\bot\}^{|\alpha_{i_j}|}$ into $\{\top\,\bot\}$, there are functions $f_{n_1},\ldots,f_{n_{m_n}}$, where f_{n_j} is a function from $\{\top,\bot\}^{|\alpha_{n_j}|}$ into $\{\top\,\bot\}$, such that:

$$\{\phi_1(\overline{f}_1/\overline{d}_1),\ldots,\phi_{n-1}(\overline{f}_{n-1}/\overline{d}_{n-1})\} \models \phi_n(\overline{f}_n/\overline{d}_n),$$

where $\phi_i(\overline{f}_i/\overline{d}_i)$ is obtained from ϕ by replacing subformulae ϕ_{i_j} with $D(f_{i_j},\overline{\alpha}_{i_j},\beta_{i_j})$.

Proof. Let first ϕ be an arbitrary formula in $\mathcal{L}$, and let $\mathrm{dep}(\overline{\alpha},\beta)$ be a subformula of ϕ. It is straightforward to show that ϕ is equivalent to

$$\bigotimes_{f\colon \{\top,\bot\}^{|\overline{\alpha}|}\to\{\top,\bot\}} \phi(D(f,\overline{\alpha},\beta)/\mathrm{dep}(\overline{\alpha},\beta)).$$

Iterating these substitutions we obtain that $\{\phi_1,\ldots,\phi_{n-1}\} \models \phi_n$ iff

$$\{\bigotimes_{\overline{f}_1} \phi_i(\overline{f}_1/\overline{d}_1),\ldots,\bigotimes_{\overline{f}_{n-1}} \phi_i(\overline{f}_{n-1}/\overline{d}_{n-1})\} \models \bigotimes_{\overline{f}_n} \phi_i(\overline{f}_n/\overline{d}_n), \tag{10}$$

where $\overline{f}_i$ ranges over sequences of functions $f_{i_1}, \ldots, f_{i_{m_i}}$ where f_{i_j} is a function from $\{\top, \bot\}^{|\overline{\alpha}_{i_j}|}$ into $\{\top \bot\}$. Now, (10) holds iff

$$\sim \bigotimes_{\overline{f}_1} \phi_1(\overline{f}_1/\overline{d}_1) \otimes \ldots \otimes \sim \bigotimes_{\overline{f}_{n-1}} \phi_{n-1}(\overline{f}_{n-1}/\overline{d}_{n-1}) \otimes \bigotimes_{\overline{f}_n} \phi_n(\overline{f}_n/\overline{d}_n) \tag{11}$$

is valid. By the usual associative rules of classical conjunction, disjunction, and negation we notice that (11) is equivalent to

$$\bigwedge_{\overline{f}_1,\ldots,\overline{f}_n} \Big(\sim\phi_1(\overline{f}_1/\overline{d}_1) \otimes \ldots \otimes \sim\phi_{n-1}(\overline{f}_{n-1}/\overline{d}_{n-1}) \otimes \bigotimes_{\overline{f}_n} \phi(\overline{f}_n/\overline{d}_n)\Big). \tag{12}$$

which is is valid iff for all $\overline{f}_1, \ldots, \overline{f}_{n-1}$,

$$\{\phi_1(\overline{f}_1/\overline{d}_1), \ldots, \phi_{n-1}(\overline{f}_{n-1}/\overline{d}_{n-1})\} \models \bigotimes_{\overline{f}_n} \phi(\overline{f}_n/\overline{d}_n). \tag{13}$$

Notice that each formula $\phi_i(\overline{f}_i/\overline{d}_i)$ belongs to $\mathcal{L}$ where $\mathcal{L} \in \{\mathsf{PL}, \mathsf{QPL}, \mathsf{ML}\}$. Hence, by Proposition 15 (12) is valid iff for all $\overline{f}_1, \ldots, \overline{f}_{n-1}$ there is $\overline{f}_n$ such that

$$\{\phi_1(\overline{f}_1/\overline{d}_1), \ldots, \phi_{n-1}(\overline{f}_{n-1}/\overline{d}_{n-1})\} \models \phi(\overline{f}_n/\overline{d}_n).$$

This shows the claim. □

The next lemma shows that Algorithm 1 provides a $\mathbf{PSPACE}^A$ decision procedure for satisfiability of RML formulae over relational Kripke models whose interpretations agree with the oracle A. For an oracle set A of words from $\{0, 1, \#\}^*$ and k-ary relation symbol R_i, we define $R_i^A := \{(b_1, \ldots, b_k) \in \{0,1\}^k \mid \mathrm{bin}(i)^\frown \# b_1 \ldots b_k \in A\}$.

Lemma 17. *Given an* RML*-formula ϕ over a vocabulary $\{S_1, \ldots, S_n\}$ and an oracle set of words A from $\{0, 1, \#\}^*$, Algorithm 1 decides in $\mathbf{PSPACE}^A$ whether there is a relational Kripke structure $\mathcal{M} = (W, R, \pi, S_1^A, \ldots, S_n^A)$ and a world $w \in W$ such that $\mathcal{M}, w \models_{\mathsf{RML}} \phi$.*

Proof. Lines 1-14 and 19-26 of Algorithm 1 constitute an algorithm of Ladner that shows the $\mathbf{PSPACE}$ upper bound for the satisfiability problem of ML [23]. Lines 15-18 consider those cases where the subformula is relational. We leave it to the reader to show (by a straightforward structural induction) that, given an input $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D})$ where $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathsf{RML}$, Algorithm 1 returns $\mathtt{Sat}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D})$ true iff there is a relational Kripke model $\mathcal{M} = (W, R, \pi, S_1^A, \ldots, S_n^A)$ such that $\mathcal{M}, w \models_{\mathsf{RML}} \phi$ if $\phi \in \mathcal{A}$; $\mathcal{M}, w \not\models_{\mathsf{RML}} \phi$ if $\phi \in \mathcal{B}$; $\mathcal{M}, w \models_{\mathsf{RML}} \Box\phi$ if $\phi \in \mathcal{C}$; and $\mathcal{M}, w \not\models_{\mathsf{RML}} \Box\phi$ if $\phi \in \mathcal{D}$. Notice that lines 15-18 stipulate that selecting $\phi \in \mathcal{A}$, where $\phi = S_i(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_k)$, $\mathtt{Sat}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D})$ returns

$$\bigvee_{(b_1,\ldots,b_k) \in S_i^A} \mathtt{Sat}(\mathcal{A} \cup \{\psi_j : b_j = 1\}) \setminus \{\phi\}, \mathcal{B} \cup \{\psi_j : b_j = 0\}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}),$$

and selecting $\phi \in \mathcal{B}$, where $\phi = S_i(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_k)$, $\mathtt{Sat}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D})$ returns

$$\bigvee_{(b_1,\ldots,b_k) \in \{0,1\}^k \setminus S_i^A} \mathtt{Sat}(\mathcal{A} \cup \{\psi_j : b_j = 1\}, (\mathcal{B} \cup \{\psi_j : b_j = 0\}) \setminus \{\phi\}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}).$$

Hence, $\mathtt{Sat}(\{\psi\}, \emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset)$ returns true iff ψ is satisfiable by $\mathcal{M}, w$ with relations $S_i^{\mathcal{M}}$ obtained from the oracle. Notice that the selection of subformulae ϕ from $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{B}$ can be made deterministically by

Input : $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D})$ where $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathsf{RML}$
Output: $\mathtt{Sat}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D})$

if $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{B} \not\subseteq \mathsf{Prop}$ **then**
  choose $\phi \in (\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{B}) \setminus \mathsf{Prop}$;
  if $\phi = \sim\psi$ *and* $\phi \in \mathcal{A}$ **then**
    return $\mathtt{Sat}(\mathcal{A} \setminus \{\phi\}, \mathcal{B} \cup \{\psi\}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D})$;
  else if $\phi = \sim\psi$ *and* $\phi \in \mathcal{B}$ **then**
    return $\mathtt{Sat}(\mathcal{A} \cup \{\psi\}, \mathcal{B} \setminus \{\phi\}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D})$;
  else if $\phi = \psi \wedge \theta$ *and* $\phi \in \mathcal{A}$ **then**
    return $\mathtt{Sat}((\mathcal{A} \cup \{\psi, \theta\}) \setminus \{\phi\}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D})$;
  else if $\phi = \psi \wedge \theta$ *and* $\phi \in \mathcal{B}$ **then**
    return $\mathtt{Sat}(\mathcal{A}, (\mathcal{B} \cup \{\psi\}) \setminus \{\phi\}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}) \vee \mathtt{Sat}(\mathcal{A}, (\mathcal{B} \cup \{\theta\}) \setminus \{\phi\}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D})$;
  else if $\phi = \Box\psi$ *and* $\phi \in \mathcal{A}$ **then**
    return $\mathtt{Sat}(\mathcal{A} \setminus \{\phi\}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C} \cup \{\psi\}, \mathcal{D})$;
  else if $\phi = \Box\psi$ *and* $\phi \in \mathcal{B}$ **then**
    return $\mathtt{Sat}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \setminus \{\phi\}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D} \cup \{\psi\})$;
  else if $\phi = S_i(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_k)$ *and* $\phi \in \mathcal{A}$ **then**
    return $\bigvee_{(b_1,\ldots,b_k) \in S_i^A} \mathtt{Sat}((\mathcal{A} \cup \{\psi_j : b_j = 1\}) \setminus \{\phi\}, \mathcal{B} \cup \{\psi_j : b_j = 0\}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D})$;
  else if $\phi = S_i(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_k)$ *and* $\phi \in \mathcal{B}$ **then**
    return $\bigvee_{(b_1,\ldots,b_k) \notin S_i^A} \mathtt{Sat}(\mathcal{A} \cup \{\psi_j : b_j = 1\}, (\mathcal{B} \cup \{\psi_j : b_j = 0\}) \setminus \{\phi\}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D})$;
  end
else if $(\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{B}) \subseteq \mathsf{Prop}$ **then**
  if $\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B} \neq \emptyset$ **then**
    return false;
  else if $\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B} = \emptyset$ *and* $\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{D} \neq \emptyset$ **then**
    return $\bigwedge_{D \in \mathcal{D}} \mathtt{Sat}(\mathcal{C}, \{D\}, \emptyset, \emptyset)$;
  else if $\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B} = \emptyset$ *and* $\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{D} = \emptyset$ **then**
    return true;
  end
end

Algorithm 1: PSPACE^A algorithm for deciding validity in RML. Notice that queries to S_i^A range over $(b_1, \ldots, b_k) \in \{0,1\}^k$.

defining an ordering for the subformulae. Following [23], let us show that the algorithm requires only $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ space on an input of the form $\mathtt{Sat}(\{\phi\}, \emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset)$: it takes $\mathcal{O}(n)$ recursive steps, each taking space $\mathcal{O}(n)$.

Size of each recursive step. At each recursive step $\mathtt{Sat}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D})$ is stored onto the work tape by listing all subformulae in $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D}$ in such a way that each subformula ψ has its major connective (or relation/proposition symbol for atomic formulae) replaced with a special marker which also points to the position of the subset ψ where is located. In addition we store at each disjunctive/conjunctive recursive step the subformula or binary number that points to the disjunct/conjunct under consideration. Each recursive step takes now space $\mathcal{O}(n)$.

Number of recursive steps. Given a set of formulae $\mathcal{A}$, we write $|\mathcal{A}|$ for $\Sigma_{\phi \in \mathcal{A}} |\phi|$ where $|\phi|$ is the length of ϕ. We show by induction on $n = |\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D}|$ that $\mathtt{Sat}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D})$ has $2n + 1$ levels of recursion. Assume that the claim holds for all natural numbers less than n, and assume that

$\mathtt{Sat}(\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B},\mathcal{C},\mathcal{D})$ calls $\mathtt{Sat}(\mathcal{A}',\mathcal{B}',\mathcal{C}',\mathcal{D}')$. Then $|\mathcal{A}'\cup\mathcal{B}'\cup\mathcal{C}'\cup\mathcal{D}'|<n$ except for the case where $\mathcal{A}\cap\mathcal{B}$ is empty and $\mathcal{C}\cap\mathcal{D}$ is not. In that case it takes at most one extra recursive step to reduce to a length $<n$. Hence, by the induction assumption the claim follows. We conclude that the space requirement for Algorithm 1 on $\mathtt{Sat}(\{\phi\},\emptyset,\emptyset,\emptyset)$ is $\mathcal{O}\left(n^2\right)$. □

Lemma 18. *The entailment problem for* EMDL *is in* $\mathbf{co\text{-}NEXPTIME^{NP}}$.

Proof. Assuming an input $\phi_1,\ldots,\phi_n$ of EMDL-formulae, we show how to decide in Π_2^{E} whether $\phi_1,\ldots,\phi_{n-1}\models\phi_n$. It suffices to construct an alternating exponential-time algorithm that switches once from universal to existential state [3]. By Lemma 16, $\phi_1,\ldots,\phi_{n-1}\models\phi_n$ iff for all $\overline{f}_1,\ldots,\overline{f}_{n-1}$ there is $\overline{f}_n$ such that

$$\{\phi_1(\overline{f}_1/\overline{d}_1),\ldots,\phi_{n-1}(\overline{f}_{n-1}/\overline{d}_{n-1})\}\models\phi(\overline{f}_n/\overline{d}_n). \tag{14}$$

Recall from the proof of Lemma 16 that all the formulae in (14) belong to ML. Hence by the flatness property (Proposition 6) $\models$ is interchangeable with $\models_{\mathsf{ML}}$ in (14). It follows that (14) holds iff

$$\phi:=\phi_1(\overline{f}_1/\overline{d}_1)\wedge\ldots\wedge\phi_{n-1}(\overline{f}_{n-1}/\overline{d}_{n-1})\wedge{\sim}\phi(\overline{f}_n/\overline{d}_n) \tag{15}$$

is not satisfiable with respect to the standard Kripke semantics of ML. Recall that each $\overline{d}_i$ is a list $\left(\phi_{i_1}:=\mathrm{dep}(\overline{\alpha}_{i_1},\beta_{i_1}),\ldots,\phi_{i_{m_i}}:=\mathrm{dep}\left(\overline{\alpha}_{i_{m_i}},\beta_{i_{m_i}}\right)\right)$ of all dependence atom subformulae that appear in ϕ_i. Also, each $\overline{f}_i$ is now a selected list of functions $f_{i_1},\ldots,f_{i_{m_i}}$, each f_{i_j} being from $\{\top,\bot\}^{|\overline{\alpha}_{i_j}|}$ to $\{0,1\}$. By the equivalence in (9) we notice that (15) is not satisfiable with respect to $\models_{\mathsf{ML}}$ iff ϕ^* is not satisfiable over the selected functions with respect to $\models_{\mathsf{RML}}$, where ϕ^* is obtained from ϕ by replacing each $D(f_{i_j},\overline{\alpha}_{i_j},\beta_{i_j})$ with the predicate $f_{i_j}(\overline{\alpha}_{i_j})=\beta_{i_j}$, and each appearance of $\neg$, $\Diamond$, or $\psi_0\vee\psi_1$ respectively with $\sim$, $\sim\Box\sim$, or $\sim(\sim\psi_0\wedge\sim\psi_1)$. The crucial point here is that ϕ^* is only of length $\mathcal{O}\left(n\log n\right)$ in the input.

The algorithm now proceeds as follows. The first step is to universally guess functions listed in $\overline{f}_1\ldots\overline{f}_{n-1}$, followed by an existential guess over functions listed in $\overline{f}_n$. The next step is to transform the input to the described RML formula ϕ^*. The last step is to run Algorithm 1 on $\mathtt{Sat}(\phi^*,\emptyset,\emptyset,\emptyset)$ replacing queries to the oracle with investigations on the guessed functions, and return true iff the algorithm returns false. By Lemma 17, Algorithm 1 returns false iff (14) holds over the selected functions. Hence, by Lemma 16 we conclude that the overall algorithm returns true iff $\phi_1,\ldots,\phi_{n-1}\models\phi_n$.

Note that this procedure involves polynomially many guesses, each of at most exponential length. Also, Algorithm 1 runs in exponential time and thus each of its implementations has at most exponentially many oracle queries. Hence, we obtain that the given procedure decides EMDL-entailment in $\mathbf{co\text{-}NEXPTIME^{NP}}$.

□

The combination of the previous lemmata now yield the following complexity results for entailment and validity of (extended) modal and (quantified) propositional dependence logics.

Theorem 19. *The entailment problem for* EMDL, MDL, QPDL, *and* PDL *is* $\mathbf{co\text{-}NEXPTIME^{NP}}$*-complete.*

Proof. The upper bound for EMDL and MDL was shown in Lemma 18, and by Theorem 12 the same upper bound applies to QPDL and PDL. The lower bound for all of the logics comes from Lemma 14. □

Theorem 20. *The validity problem for* EMDL, MDL, QPDL, *and* PDL *is* $\mathbf{NEXPTIME}$*-complete.*

Proof. Since the algorithm in the proof of Lemma 18 involves no universal branhcing, given an empty assumption set, we obtain a **NEXPTIME** upper bound for the validity problem of EMDL and MDL. Also, by Proposition 4 and 3 a formula $\phi \in \mathsf{QPDL}$ is valid iff $X_{\mathrm{comp}} \models \phi$, where X_{comp} is the complete binary team over $\mathsf{Fr}(\phi)$, i.e., $X_{\mathrm{comp}} := {}^{\mathsf{Fr}(\phi)}\{0,1\}$. Since this team is exponential in ϕ, and QPDL model checking can be done in non-deterministic polynomial time, we obtain a **NEXPTIME** upper bound for QPDL and PDL. The lower bound for all of the logics comes from Lemma 13. □

It is worth noting that the proof of Lemma 18 gives also rise to an alternative proof for the **NEXPTIME** upper bound for EMDL satisfiability. Moreover, the technique can be succesfully applied to $\mathsf{ML}(\otimes)$. Hella et al. showed in [15] that EMDL is exponentially more succint than $\mathsf{ML}(\otimes)$. Hence, in light of Theorems 19 and 20 the following result is no surprise anymore.

Theorem 21. *The satisfiability, validity, and entailment problems for* $\mathsf{ML}(\otimes)$ *are* **PSPACE***-complete.*

Proof. The lower bound follows from the **PSPACE**-hardness of satisfiability and validity problems for ML [23]. For the upper bound, it suffices to consider the entailment problem. The other cases are analogous. As in the proof of Lemma 16 (see also Theorem 5.2 in [32]) we reduce $\mathsf{ML}(\otimes)$-formulae to large disjunctions where disjuncts range over a set of choice functions. For a $\mathsf{ML}(\otimes)$-formula θ, denote by F_θ the set of all functions that map subformulae $\alpha \otimes \beta$ of θ to either α or β. For each $f \in F_\theta$, we then denote by θ^f the formula obtained from θ by replacing each subformula of the form $\alpha \otimes \beta$ with $f(\alpha \otimes \beta)$. It straightforward to show that θ is equivalent to $\bigvee_{f \in F_\theta} \theta^f$. Let now $\phi_1, \ldots, \phi_n$ be a sequence of $\mathsf{ML}(\otimes)$ formulae. Analogously to the proof of Lemma 16 we can show using Proposition 15 that $\phi_1, \ldots, \phi_{n-1} \models \phi_n$ iff for all $f_1 \in F_{\phi_1}, \ldots, f_{n-1} \in F_{\phi_{n-1}}$ there is $f_n \in F_{\phi_n}$ such that some of $\{\phi_1^{f_1}, \ldots, \phi_{n-1}^{f_{n-1}}\} \models \phi_n^{f_n}$. Notice that the number of intuitionistic disjunctions appearing in $\phi_1, \ldots, \phi_n$ is polynomial, and hence any single sequence of functions $f_1 \in F_{\theta_1}, \ldots, f_n \in F_{\theta_n}$ can be stored using only a polynomial amount of space. It follows that the decision procedure depicted in the proof of Lemma 18 can be now implemented in polynomial space. We immediately obtain the **PSPACE** upper bound for validity. For satisfiability, notice that $\bigvee_{f \in F_\theta} \theta^f$ is satisfiable iff θ^f is satisfiable for some $f \in F_\theta$. Checking the right-hand side can be done as described above. This concludes the proof. □

Combining the proofs of Lemma 18 and Theorem 21 we also notice that satifiability, validity, and entailment can be decided in **PSPACE** for EMDL-formulae whose dependence atoms are of *logarithmic length*.

4 Entailment in Modal and Quantified Propositional Independence Logics

For quantified propositional independence logic we obtain that the complexity of validity and entailment coincide as both are shown to be $\mathbf{co\text{-}NEXPTIME^{NP}}$-complete. The upper bound is a simple adaptation of the standard model checking algorithm for team-based logics. The lower bound can be shown by reducing from $\mathrm{TRUE}(\Pi_2\text{-ADQBF})$ to the validity problem of quantified propositional logic extended with both dependence and inclusion atoms. Then by Galliani's translation from dependence and inclusion logic to independence logic the result follows [7].

Lemma 22. *The entailment problem for* QPLInd *is in* $\mathbf{co\text{-}NEXPTIME^{NP}}$.

Proof. We describe a simple Π_2^{E} decision procedure for the entailment problem of QPLInd. The basis of this procedure is the standard model checking algorithm for team-based logics arising directly from the definition of team semantics. For QPLInd the input is a propositional team X and a QPLInd-formula ϕ, and the algorithm decides non-deterministically whether X satisfies ϕ Notice that non-determinism is only needed when considering disjunctive or existentially quantified formulae. For the details of the algorithm, refer to [6]. Let us denote this model checking procedure for X and ϕ by $\mathsf{MC}(X, \phi)$. Notice that the running time of $\mathsf{MC}(X, \phi)$ is not bounded by a polynomial due to possible quantification in ϕ. Instead, the procedure takes time $f(|X|)g(|\phi|)$ for some polynomial function f and an exponential function g.

Let us denote by $\mathsf{MC}^*(X, \phi)$ the non-deterministic algorithm obtained from $\mathsf{MC}(X, \phi)$ by replacing existential guesses with universal ones. Based on $\mathsf{MC}(X, \phi)$ and $\mathsf{MC}^*(X, \phi)$ we now present the decision procedure for QPLInd-entailment. Assume we are given a sequence of QPLInd-formulae $\phi_1, \ldots, \phi_n$, and the question is to determine whether $\{\phi_1, \ldots, \phi_{n-1}\} \models \phi_n$. The procedure runs as follows. First universally guess a team X over variables that occur free in some $\phi_1, \ldots, \phi_n$. Then for $i = 1, \ldots, n-1$ proceed as follows. First run $\mathsf{MC}^*(X, \phi_i)$. If $\mathsf{MC}^*(X, \phi_i)$ returns false, then return true. If $\mathsf{MC}^*(X, \phi_i)$ returns true and $i < n - 1$, then move to $i + 1$. Otherwise, if $\mathsf{MC}^*(X, \phi_i)$ returns true and $i = n - 1$, then switch to existential state and run $\mathsf{MC}(X, \phi_n)$ returning true iff $\mathsf{MC}(X, \phi_n)$ returns true.

It is straightforward to check that the described algorithm returns true iff $\{\phi_1, \ldots, \phi_{n-1}\} \models \phi_n$. Also, notice that the universally guessed team X has possibly exponential size, and the algorithm alternates once from universal to existential state. Since $\mathsf{MC}(X, \phi)$ and $\mathsf{MC}^*(X, \phi)$ both run in time $f(|X|)g(|\phi|)$, for some polynomial function f and an exponential function g, it follows that the procedure is in Π_2^{E}. □

Before proving Lemma 24, we state the following result by Galliani.

Theorem 23 ([7])**.** *The inclusion atom $\overline{p} \subseteq \overline{q}$ is equivalent to*

$$\phi := \forall v_1 \forall v_2 \forall \overline{r}\big((\overline{r} \neq \overline{p} \wedge \overline{r} \neq \overline{q}) \vee (v_1 \neq v_2 \wedge \overline{r} \neq \overline{q}) \vee ((v_1 = v_2 \vee \overline{r} = \overline{q}) \wedge v_1 v_2 \perp_{\overline{r}})\big).$$

The above theorem was shown in the first-order inclusion and independence logic setting but can be applied to the quantified propositional setting too since ϕ and $\overline{p} \subseteq \overline{q}$ are satisfied by a binary team X in the quantified propositional setting iff they are satisfied by X and the structure $\{0, 1\}$ in the first-order setting. The lower bound can be now shown by relating to $\mathrm{TRUE}(\Pi_2\text{-ADQBF})$.

Lemma 24. *The validity problem for* QPLInd *is* $\mathbf{co\text{-}NEXPTIME^{NP}}$*-hard.*

Proof. We reduce from $\mathrm{TRUE}(\Pi_2\text{-ADQBF})$ which is $\mathbf{co\text{-}NEXPTIME^{NP}}$-hard by Theorem 9. Let $(\phi, \mathcal{C})$ be an instance of Π_2-ADQBF. Then ϕ is of the form

$$\forall p_1 \ldots \forall p_n \mathsf{U}\, q_1 \ldots \mathsf{U}\, q_m \exists q_{m+1} \ldots \exists q_{m+m'} \theta$$

and $\mathcal{C}$ lists tuples $\overline{c}_i$ of elements from $\{p_1, \ldots, p_n\}$, for $i = 1, \ldots, m + m'$. We show how to construct in polynomial time from ϕ a QPLInd-formula ψ such that ψ is valid iff ϕ is true. First, let us construct top-down recursively formulae ψ_i, for $i = 1, \ldots, m$, as follows:

$$\psi_i := \exists r_i\big(\mathrm{dep}(\overline{c}_i q_i, r_i) \wedge \mathrm{dep}(\overline{c}_i r_i, q_i) \wedge \forall r_i'(\neg r_i' \vee (r_i' \wedge \overline{c}_i r_i' \subseteq \overline{c}_i r_i)) \wedge (\neg r_i \vee (r_i \wedge \psi_{i+1}))\big). \quad (16)$$

Notice that $\mathrm{dep}(\overline{p}, q)$ is equivalent to $q \perp_{\overline{p}} q$. Intuitively, the first two conjuncts indicate a selection of a maximal subteam satisfying $\mathrm{dep}(\overline{c}_i, q_i)$. The members of that subteam are marked by assigning r_i to

1. The last conjuct indicates that the selected subteam satisfies ψ_{i+1}. Define then

$$\psi_{m+1} := \theta \vee \bigvee_{i=m+1}^{m+m'} \mathrm{dep}(\overline{c}_i, q_i)\,.$$

We now claim that $\psi := \psi_1$ is valid iff ϕ is true. Assume first that ψ is valid, and let f_i be any function from $\{0,1\}^{|\overline{c}_i|} \to \{0,1\}$ for $i = 1, \ldots, m$. Let X be the team that consists of all assignments s that map $p_1, \ldots, p_n, q_{m+1}, \ldots, q_{m+m'}$ into $\{0,1\}$ and $q_1, \ldots, q_n$ to $f(s(\overline{c}_1)), \ldots, f(s(\overline{c}_n))$. By the assumption $X \models \psi$. Hence, we find $F_1 \colon X \to \mathcal{P}(X) \setminus \{\emptyset\}$ such that

$$X[F_1/q_1] \models \mathrm{dep}(\overline{c}_1 q_1, r_1) \wedge \mathrm{dep}(\overline{c}_1 r_1, q_1) \wedge \forall r_1'(\neg r_1' \vee (r_1' \wedge \overline{c}_1 r_1' \subseteq \overline{c}_1 r_1)) \wedge (\neg r_1 \vee (r_1 \wedge \psi_2)). \quad (17)$$

Let $X' := X[F_1/r_1][1/r_1']$. Then $X' \models \mathrm{dep}(\overline{c}_1, q_1)$ by the construction and $X' \models \mathrm{dep}(\overline{c}_1 q_1, r_1)$ by (17), and hence $X' \models \mathrm{dep}(\overline{c}_1, r_1)$. Also by the third conjunct of (17) $X' \models \overline{c}_1 r_1' \subseteq \overline{c}_1 r_1$. Therefore, it cannot be the case that that $s(r_1) = 0$ for some $s \in X'$, and hence by the last conjunct of (17) $X[1/r_1] \models \psi_2$. After n iterations we obtain that $X[1/r_1] \ldots [1/r_n] \models \psi_{m+1}$ which implies by Proposition (4) that $X \models \psi_{m+1}$. Hence, there are $Z, Y_1, \ldots, Y_{m'} \subseteq X$ such that $Z \cup Y_1 \cup \ldots \cup Y_{m'} = X$, $Z \models \theta$, and $Y_i \models \mathrm{dep}(\overline{c}_{m+i}, q_{m+i})$ for $i = 1, \ldots, m'$. Notice that we are now at the same position as in the proof of Lemma 14. Hence, we obtain that ϕ is true and that the direction from left to right holds.

Assume then that ϕ is true, and let X be any team over the variables $p_1, \ldots, p_n, q_1, \ldots, q_{m+m'}$. First we choose mappings F_i so that for each value $\overline{b}$ of $X(\overline{c}_i)$ either the assignments $s : \overline{c}_i q_i \mapsto \overline{b}0$ or the assignments $s' : \overline{c}_i q_i \mapsto \overline{b}1$ are mapped to 1. The remaining assignments are mapped to 0. It is easy to see that $X[F_i/r_i]$ satisfies the first two conjuncts of (16) and that $\{s \in X[F_i/r_i] \mid F(s) = 0\}$ satisfies $\neg r_i$. We are left to show that $X' := \{s \in X[F_1/q_1] \ldots [F_n/q_n] : F_1(s) = \ldots = F_n(s_n) = 1\}$ satisfies ψ_{m+1}. By the selection of functions $F_1, \ldots, F_n$ we notice that X' satisfies $\mathrm{dep}(\overline{c}_i, q_i)$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$. Again, following the proof of Lemma 14 we obtain that X' satisfies $\theta \vee \bigvee_{i=m+1}^{m+m'} \mathrm{dep}(\overline{c}_i, q_i)$. This shows the direction from right to left. Since the reduction from ϕ to ψ can be done in polynomial time, this concludes the proof.

□

Lemmata 22 and 24 together imply the same exact complexity bound for validity and entailment of quantified propositional independence logic. Corollary 26 follows immediately from Theorems 25 and 12.

Theorem 25. *The entailment and the validity problems for* QPLInd *are* **co-NEXPTIME$^{\mathbf{NP}}$**-*complete.*

Corollary 26. *The entailment and the validity problems for* MLInd *are* **co-NEXPTIME$^{\mathbf{NP}}$**-*hard.*

5 Entailment in Modal and Quantified Propositional Inclusion Logics

For quantified propositional inclusion logic we show that the entailment problem is **co-NEXPTIME**-complete. The upper bound is based on a model checking algorithm (Algorithm 2) for team-based inclusion logics from [13]. The lower bound follows by a reduction from $\mathrm{TRUE}(\Pi_1\text{-ADQBF})$.

Notice that in Algorithm 2 $\texttt{MaxSub}(X, \phi)$ gives the maximal subset of X that satisfies ϕ. By the union closure property of QPLInc, such team always exists [7]. A formula is said to be *closed under unions* if its truth is preserved under taking unions of teams.

Input : (X, ϕ) where X is a propositional team over $\mathsf{Fr}(\phi)$ and $\phi \in \mathsf{QPLInc}$
Output: $\mathtt{MaxSub}(X, \phi)$

if $\phi = \exists p\psi$ **then**
  return $\{s \in X \mid s(0/p) \in \mathtt{MaxSub}(X[\{0,1\}/p], \psi)$ or $s(1/p) \in \mathtt{MaxSub}(X[\{0,1\}/p], \psi)\}$;
else if $\phi = \forall p\psi$ **then**
  $Y \leftarrow X[\{0,1\}/p]$;
  while $Y \neq \{s \in Y \mid \{s(0/p), s(1/p)\} \subseteq \mathtt{MaxSub}(Y, \psi)\}$ **do**
    $Y \leftarrow \{s \in Y \mid \{s(0/p), s(1/p)\} \subseteq \mathtt{MaxSub}(Y, \psi)\}$;
  end
  return $\{s \in X \mid \{s(0/p), s(1/p)\} \subseteq Y\}$
else if $\phi = \psi \vee \theta$ **then**
  return $\mathtt{MaxSub}(X, \psi) \cup \mathtt{MaxSub}(X, \theta)$;
else if $\phi = \psi \wedge \theta$ **then**
  $Y \leftarrow X$;
  while $Y \neq \mathtt{MaxSub}(\mathtt{MaxSub}(Y, \psi), \theta)$ **do**
    $Y \leftarrow \mathtt{MaxSub}(\mathtt{MaxSub}(Y, \psi), \theta)$;
  end
  return Y;
else if $\phi = p$ **then**
  return $\{s \in X \mid s(p) = 1\}$;
else if $\phi = \neg p$ **then**
  return $\{s \in X \mid s(p) = 0\}$;
else if $\overline{p} \subseteq \overline{q}$ **then**
  $Y \leftarrow X$;
  while $Y \neq \{s \in Y \mid s(\overline{p}) \subseteq Y(\overline{q})\}$ **do**
    $Y \leftarrow \{s \in Y \mid s(\overline{p}) \subseteq Y(\overline{q})\}$;
  end
  return Y
end

Algorithm 2: A deterministic model checking algorithm for QPLInc

Lemma 27. *The entailment problem for* QPLInc *is in* **co-NEXPTIME**.

Proof. Consider the computation of $\mathtt{MaxSub}(X, \phi)$ in Algorithm 2. We leave it to the reader to show, by straightforward induction on the complexity of ϕ, that for all X, Y over a shared domain $V \supseteq \mathsf{Fr}(\phi)$ the following two claims holds: (i) $\mathtt{MaxSub}(X, \phi) \models \phi$ and (ii) $Y \subseteq X \wedge Y \models \phi \Rightarrow Y \subseteq \mathtt{MaxSub}(X, \phi)$. The idea is that each subset of X satisfying ϕ survives each iteration step. Since $\mathtt{MaxSub}(X, \phi) \subseteq X$, it now follows directly from (i) and (ii) that $\mathtt{MaxSub}(X, \phi) = X$ iff $X \models \phi$. Notice that $\mathtt{MaxSub}(X, \phi)$ is the unique maximal subteam of X satisfying ϕ.

Let us now present the universal exponential-time algorithm for deciding entailment for QPL. Assuming an input sequence $\phi_1, \ldots, \phi_n$ from QPLInc, the question is to decide whether $\{\phi_1, \ldots, \phi_{n-1}\} \models \phi_n$. The algorithm first universally guesses a team X over $\bigcup_{i=1}^{n} \mathsf{Fr}(\phi_i)$ and then using Algorithm 2 deterministically tests whether X violates $\{\phi_1, \ldots, \phi_{n-1}\} \models \phi_n$, returning true iff this is not the case. By the locality principle of QPL (Proposition 4) this suffices, that is, each universal branch returns true iff $\{\phi_1, \ldots, \phi_{n-1}\} \models \phi_n$.

It remains to show that the procedure runs in exponential time. Consider first the running time of Algorithm 2 over an input (X, ϕ). First note that one can find an exponential function g such that at each recursive step $\texttt{MaxSub}(Y, \psi)$ the size of the team Y is bounded by $|X|g(|\phi|)$. The possible exponential blow-up comes from nested quantification in ϕ. Notice that each base step $\texttt{MaxSub}(Y, \psi)$ can be computed in polynomial time in the size of Y. Also, each recursive step $\texttt{MaxSub}(Y, \psi)$ involves at most $|Y|$ iterations consisting of either computations of $\texttt{MaxSub}(Z, \theta)$ for $Z \subseteq Y$ and a subformula θ of ψ, or removals of assignments from Y. It follows by induction that there exists a polynomial f and an exponential h such that the running time of $\texttt{MaxSub}(Y, \psi)$ is bounded by $f(|X|)h(|\phi|)$. The overall algorithm now guesses first a team X whose size is possibly exponential in the input. By the previous reasoning, the running time of $\texttt{MaxSub}(X, \phi_i)$ remains exponential for each ϕ_i. This shows the claim. □

Lemma 28. *The entailment problem for* QPLInc *is* **co-NEXPTIME***-hard.*

Proof. It follows from Theorem 9 that $\mathrm{TRUE}(\Pi_1\text{-ADQBF})$ is **co-NEXPTIME**-hard[2]. Let $(\phi, \mathcal{C})$ be an instance of Π_1-ADQBF. Then ϕ is of the form $\forall p_1 \dots \forall p_n \mathsf{U}\, q_1 \dots \mathsf{U}\, q_m \theta$ and $\mathcal{C}$ lists tuples $\overline{c}_i$ of elements from $\{p_1, \dots, p_n\}$, for $i = 1, \dots, n$. We show how to construct in polynomial time from ϕ a set $\Sigma \cup \{\psi\}$ of QPLInc-formulae such that ϕ is true iff $\Sigma \models \psi$. Denote by $\overline{p}$ and $\overline{q}$ respectively the sequences $p_1 \dots p_n$ and $q_1 \dots q_n$. Let $\overline{d}_i$ list the variables of $\{p_1, \dots, p_n\}$ that do not occur in $\overline{c}_i$, and let $\overline{p}'$ and $\overline{q}'$ denote respectively two lists of distinct copies $p'_1 \dots p'_n$ and $q'_1 \dots q'_m$. Moreover, let $\overline{v}_i$ be a list of fresh variables of length $|\overline{c}_i|$, for $i = 1, \dots, m$. We let $\Sigma = \{\phi_1, \dots, \phi_4\}$ where

- $\phi_1 := t \wedge \neg f$,
- $\phi_2 := \bigwedge_{i=1}^{n} (p_1 \dots p_{i-1} t \subseteq p_1 \dots p_{i-1} p_i \wedge p_1 \dots p_{i-1} f \subseteq p_1 \dots p_{i-1} p_i)$,
- $\phi_3 := \theta^{\perp}(\overline{p}'\overline{q}'/\overline{pq})$,
- $\phi_4 := \overline{p}'\overline{q}' \subseteq \overline{pq}$.

Let us also define $\psi := \bigvee_{i=1}^{m} \exists \overline{v}_i (\overline{v}_i t \subseteq \overline{c}_i q_i \wedge \overline{v}_i f \subseteq \overline{c}_i q_i)$. We claim that ϕ is true iff $\Sigma \models \psi$. Assume first that ϕ is false. Then there are functions $f_i \colon \{0,1\}^{|\overline{c}_i|} \to \{0,1\}$ such that for some assignment $s \colon \{p_1, \dots, p_n\} \to \{0,1\}$, $s' := s\big(f(s(\overline{c}_1))/q_1, \dots, f(s(\overline{c}_n))/q_n\big)$ does not satisfy θ. Let X be a team that consists of all assignments t that map

- t to 1 and f to 0;
- p_i into $\{0,1\}$;
- q_i to $f_i(t(\overline{c}_i))$; and
- p'_i to $s'(p'_i)$ and q'_i to $s'(q'_i)$.

It is straightforward to check that $X \models \Sigma$. However, for no $i = 1, \dots, m$ and $\overline{a} \in \{0,1\}^{|\overline{c}_i|}$ there are $t_0, t_1 \in X$ such that $t_0(\overline{c}_i) = t_1(\overline{c}_i) = \overline{a}$ and $t_0(q_i) = 0$ and $t_1(q_i) = 1$. It follows that $X \not\models \psi$ which concludes the direction from right to left.

Assume then that ϕ is true, and assume that X is a team satisfying Σ. It follows that $X \not\models \bigwedge_{i=1}^{m} \mathrm{dep}(\overline{c}_i, q_i)$. Let $t_0, t_1 \in X$ be such that they agree on q_i but disagree on $\overline{c}_i$ for some $i = 1, \dots, m$. Then, let $F \colon s \mapsto t_0(\overline{c}_i)$. Clearly, $X[F/\overline{v}] \models \bigvee_{i=1}^{m} \exists \overline{v}_i (\overline{v}_i t \subseteq \overline{c}_i q_i \wedge \overline{v}_i f \subseteq \overline{c}_i q_i)$ which show the direction from left to right and thus the claim.

□

[2]Even and odd numbers restrict the theorem from $k \geq 2$.

Lemmata 27 and 28 now yield the following exact complexity bound.

Theorem 29. *The entailment problem for* QPLInc *is* **co-NEXPTIME**-*complete.*

The lower bound for modal inclusion logic follows from Theorems 29 and 12. Recently [13] showed that the same lower bound applies also the validity problem of MLInc. In contrast, satisfiability for MLInc is only **EXPTIME**-complete [14].

Theorem 30 ([13])**.** *The entailment and the validity problem for* MLInc *are* **co-NEXPTIME**-*hard.*

6 Axiomatizing Modal and Propositional Dependence Logics

In this section we construct sound and complete axiomatizations for (quantified) propositional and modal dependence logic. Previous axiomatizations in [28, 34] relate to logics PL($\textcircled{\scriptsize D}$) and ML($\textcircled{\scriptsize D}$) by using compositional translations of the form (8). We do not directly refer to these logics. Instead, rule dep E reflects the universal branching of the Π_2^{E} entailment algorithm. Since validity can be decided in Σ_1^{E}, this rule is not needed in deductions of valid formulae. Rules dep I and $\vee$ E are used to extract dependence atoms from disjunctions of flat formulae.

Denote by $\mathcal{G}$ the set of rules in Figure 1, and denote by $\mathcal{Q}$ the rules for quantification and by $\mathcal{M}$ the rules for modal operators in Figure 2. First we show that the rules are sound.

Lemma 31. *The rules* $\vee$ S, $\vee$ A, $\wedge$ I, $\wedge$ E, $\vee$ I, dep I, $\vee$ E, dep E *are sound for* PDL, QPDL, *and* MDL *(Figure 1). The rules* $\forall$ I, $\forall$ E, $\exists$ I, $\exists$ E *are sound for* QPDL, *and the rules* $\Box$ R, $\Diamond$ R *are sound for* MDL *(Figure 2).*

Proof. The rules $\vee$ S, $\vee$ A, $\wedge$ I, $\wedge$ E, $\vee$ I were proven sound in the (first-order) dependence logic context in [21]. Since analogous soundness proofs apply in the (quantified) propositional and modal dependence logic context, we omit those cases. The quantification rules ($\exists$ I, $\exists$ E, $\forall$ I, $\forall$ E) were also proven sound in the dependence logic context in [21], with the exception that the QPL-formula θ was replaced with a first-order term t. The soundness proofs for QPL are however perfectly analogous and hence omitted here. The rules dep I, $\Box$ R, $\Diamond$ R are obviously sound. Hence, we are left with the rules $\vee$ E and dep E. Let us now prove the claim by induction on the length of derivation. Let $\phi_1, \ldots, \phi_n$ be a sequence of formulae, and assume that ϕ_n is deduced from its predecessors using the given rules. Assume that the last used rule is either $\vee$ E or dep E. We show in both cases that $\{\phi_1, \ldots, \phi_{n-1}\} \models \phi$.

Case: $\vee$ E. Assume that the last used rule is $\vee$ E. Then there is a shorter deduction of $(\mathrm{dep}(\overline{\alpha}, \beta) \wedge \phi(\overline{\alpha})) \vee (\mathrm{dep}(\overline{\alpha}, \beta) \wedge \phi'(\overline{\alpha}))$ from $\phi_1, \ldots, \phi_{n-1}$, and of $p \wedge \neg p$ from $\phi(\overline{\alpha}) \wedge \phi'(\overline{\alpha}))$. Let X be a team satisfying $\phi_1, \ldots, \phi_n$. Then by the induction assumption X satisfies $(\mathrm{dep}(\overline{\alpha}, \beta) \wedge \phi(\overline{\alpha})) \vee (\mathrm{dep}(\overline{\alpha}, \beta) \wedge \phi'(\overline{\alpha}))$ and hence there are $Y, Z \subseteq X$, $Y \cup Z = X$, such that Y satisfies $(\mathrm{dep}(\overline{\alpha}, \beta) \wedge \phi(\overline{\alpha}))$ and Z satisfies $(\mathrm{dep}(\overline{\alpha}, \beta) \wedge \phi'(\overline{\alpha}))$. Assume to the contrary that X does not satisfy $\mathrm{dep}(\overline{\alpha}, \beta)$. Then there are $s, s' \in X$ which agree on $\overline{\alpha}$ but disagree on β. Hence, s and s' cannot both belong to Y (or Z). Assume by symmetry that $s \in Y$ and $s' \in Z$ in which case by Theorem 2 s satisfies $\phi(\overline{\alpha})$ and s' satisfies $\phi'(\overline{\alpha})$. Since s and s' agree on α, s satisfies $\phi(\overline{\alpha}) \wedge \phi'(\overline{\alpha})$ and by Theorem 2 also $\phi_1, \ldots, \phi_{n-1}$. Hence, by the induction assumption s satisfies $p \wedge \neg p$, a contradiction. The counterexample is therefore false and X satisfies $\mathrm{dep}(\overline{\alpha}, \beta)$ which shows the case $\vee$ E.

Case: dep E. Assume that the last used rule is dep E. Then there is a shorter deduction of ϕ from $\phi_1, \ldots, \phi_{n-1}$ and shorter deductions of ψ from $\phi(D(f, \overline{\alpha}, \beta)/\mathrm{dep}(\overline{\alpha}, \beta))$ for all $f\colon \{\top, \bot\}^{|\overline{\alpha}|} \to \{\top, \bot\}$. Let X be a team satisfying $\phi_1, \ldots, \phi_n$. Then by the induction assumption X satisfies ϕ, and we find $f\colon \{\top, \bot\}^{|\overline{\alpha}|} \to \{\top, \bot\}$ such that X satisfies $\phi(D(f, \overline{\alpha}, \beta)/\mathrm{dep}(\overline{\alpha}, \beta))$. By the induction assumption, X satisfies ϕ which shows the case $\vee$ E and concludes the proof. $\square$


$\frac{\phi \vee \psi}{\psi \vee \phi}$ (∨ S)
$\frac{(\phi \vee \psi) \vee \theta}{\phi \vee (\psi \vee \theta)}$ (∨ A)
$\frac{\phi \vee \psi \quad \begin{matrix}[\psi]\\ \vdots \\ \theta\end{matrix}}{\phi \vee \theta}$ (∨ I)
$\frac{\phi \quad \psi}{\phi \wedge \psi}$ (∧ I)
$\frac{\phi \wedge \psi}{\phi}$ $\frac{\phi \wedge \psi}{\psi}$ (∧ E)
$\frac{\beta}{\mathrm{dep}(\overline{\alpha}, \beta)}$ $\frac{\neg\beta}{\mathrm{dep}(\overline{\alpha}, \beta)}$ (dep I)
$\frac{(\mathrm{dep}(\overline{\alpha}, \beta) \wedge \phi(\overline{\alpha})) \vee (\mathrm{dep}(\overline{\alpha}, \beta) \wedge \phi'(\overline{\alpha})) \qquad \begin{matrix}[\phi(\overline{\alpha}) \wedge \phi'(\overline{\alpha})]\\ \vdots \\ p \wedge \neg p\end{matrix}}{\mathrm{dep}(\overline{\alpha}, \beta)}$ (1) (∨ E)
$\frac{\phi \qquad \begin{matrix}\forall f : [\phi(D(f, \overline{\alpha}, \beta)/\mathrm{dep}(\overline{\alpha}, \beta))]\\ \vdots \\ \psi\end{matrix}}{\psi}$ (dep E)

(1) ϕ does not contain dependence atoms.

Figure 1: General rules of inference $\mathcal{G}$ for PDL, QPDL, and MDL.


$\frac{\phi}{\forall p\phi}$ (1) (∀ I)
$\frac{\forall p\phi}{\phi(\theta/p)}$ (2) (∀ E)
$\frac{\phi(\theta/p)}{\exists p\phi}$ (2) (∃ I)
$\frac{\exists p\phi \quad \begin{matrix}[\phi]\\ \vdots \\ \psi\end{matrix}}{\phi}$ (3) (∃ E)
$\frac{\Box\phi \quad \begin{matrix}\phi\\ \vdots \\ \psi\end{matrix}}{\Box\psi}$ (□ R)
$\frac{\Diamond\phi \quad \begin{matrix}\phi\\ \vdots \\ \psi\end{matrix}}{\Diamond\psi}$ (◇ R)

(1) p does not appear free in any non-discharged assumption used in the derivation of ϕ.
(2) $\theta \in$ QPL and in the substitution $\phi(\theta/p)$ no free variable in θ becomes bound.
(3) p does not appear free in ψ and in any non-discharged assumption used in the derivation of ψ, except in ϕ.

Figure 2: Special rules of inference $\mathcal{Q}$ for QPDL (∀ I, ∀ E, $\exists I$, $\exists E$) and $\mathcal{M}$ for MDL (□ R, ◇ R).

Theorem 32. *Let $\mathcal{A}$,$\mathcal{B}$, and $\mathcal{C}$ be respectively sound and complete axiomatizations for the negation normal form fragments of* PL, QPL, *and* ML. *Then:*

(1) $\mathcal{A} \cup (\{\mathcal{G}\} \setminus \{\text{dep E}\})$ is sound and complete for the validity problem of PDL, *and $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{G}$ is sound and complete for the entailment problem of* PDL

(2) $\mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{Q} \cup (\{\mathcal{G}\} \setminus \{\text{dep E}\})$ is sound and complete for the validity problem of QPDL, *and $\mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{Q} \cup \mathcal{G}$ is sound and complete for the entailment problem of* QPDL

(3) $\mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{M} \cup (\{\mathcal{G}\} \setminus \{\text{dep E}\})$ is sound and complete for the validity problem of EMDL, *and $\mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{M} \cup \mathcal{G}$ is sound and complete for the entailment problem of* EMDL.

Proof. Soundness of the axiomatizations follow by the assumption and by Lemma 31. Let us show completeness of the axiomatizations. Consider first the validity problem for EMDL. Assume that ϕ is a valid EMDL formula. Let $\overline{d} = \big(\mathrm{dep}(\overline{\alpha}_1, \beta_1), \ldots, \mathrm{dep}(\overline{\alpha}_n, \beta_n)\big)$ list all dependence atom subformulae of ϕ. By Lemma 16 there are functions $f_1 \colon \{\top, \bot\}^{|\overline{\alpha}_1|} \to \{\top, \bot\}, \ldots, f_n \colon \{\top, \bot\}^{|\overline{\alpha}_n|} \to \{\top, \bot\}$ such that

$$\phi^* := \phi\big(D(f_1, \overline{\alpha}_1, \beta_1)/\mathrm{dep}(\overline{\alpha}_1, \beta_1), \ldots, D(f_n, \overline{\alpha}_n, \beta_n)/\mathrm{dep}(\overline{\alpha}_n, \beta_n)\big) \tag{18}$$

is valid. Since ϕ^* is a ML formula in negation normal form, we obtain that it is derivable by $\mathcal{C}$. Hence it suffices to deduce ϕ from ϕ^*. By using the rules $\vee$ S, $\vee$ A, $\vee$ I, $\wedge$ I, $\wedge$ E, $\Box$ R, and $\Diamond$ R we notice that $\phi^* \vdash \phi$ if $D(f_1, \overline{\alpha}_1, \beta_i) \vdash \mathrm{dep}(\overline{\alpha}_i, \beta_i)$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$. Recall that $D(f_i, \overline{\alpha}_i, \beta_i)$ is the formula

$$\bigvee_{a_1,\ldots,a_n \in \{\top,\bot\}} \alpha_1^{a_1} \wedge \ldots \wedge \alpha_n^{a_n} \wedge \beta^{f(a_1,\ldots,a_n)}, \tag{19}$$

for $\overline{\alpha}_i = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n)$. Using dep I and rules in $\mathcal{G}$ we may deduce

$$\bigvee_{a_1,\ldots,a_n \in \{\top,\bot\}} \alpha_1^{a_1} \wedge \ldots \wedge \alpha_n^{a_n} \wedge \mathrm{dep}(\overline{\alpha}_i, \beta_i) \tag{20}$$

from (19). Define now $\theta_X := \mathrm{dep}(\overline{\alpha}_i, \beta_i) \wedge \psi_X$ and

$$\psi_X := \bigvee_{(a_1,\ldots,a_n) \in X} \alpha_1^{a_1} \wedge \ldots \wedge \alpha_n^{a_n}$$

for a set X of sequences $(a_1, \ldots, a_n) \in \{\top, \bot\}^n$. We show that $\theta_Y \vee \theta_Z \vdash \theta_{Y \cup Z}$ if Y and Z are disjoint. First notice that $\psi_Y \wedge \psi_Z$ is now a non-satisfiable negation normal form ML formula, and therefore $\psi_Y \wedge \psi_Z \vdash p \wedge \neg p$ by the completeness of $\mathcal{C}$. Hence, $\theta_Y \vee \theta_Z \vdash \mathrm{dep}(\overline{\alpha}_i, \beta_i)$ by $\vee$ E. Moreover, using $\vee$ S, $\vee$ I, and $\wedge$ E we obtain that $\theta_Y \vee \theta_Z \vdash \psi_{Y \cup Z}$. Hence, the claim follows by $\wedge$ I.

By iterating the previous procedure and using the disjunction rules of $\mathcal{G}$ we obtain

$$\mathrm{dep}(\overline{\alpha}_i, \beta_i) \wedge \bigvee_{a_1,\ldots,a_n \in \{\top,\bot\}} \alpha_1^{a_1} \wedge \ldots \wedge \alpha_n^{a_n}$$

from (20). Therefore, $D(f_1, \overline{\alpha}_1, \beta_i) \vdash \mathrm{dep}(\overline{\alpha}_i, \beta_i)$ by $\wedge$ E. This shows that ϕ is derivable from ϕ^* using only the rules in $\mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{M} \cup (\{\mathcal{G}\} \setminus \{\text{dep E}\})$.

Consider then the entailment problem of EMDL. Assume that $\{\phi_1, \ldots, \phi_{n-1}\} \models \phi_n$ for a sequence of EMDL formulae $\phi_1, \ldots, \phi_n$. Assuming there are in total n dependence atom subformulae in $\phi_1, \ldots, \phi_{n-1}$, then the first step is to iterate dep E n many times, arriving at formulae $\phi_1^*, \ldots, \phi_{n-1}^*$, each of the form (18). By Lemma 16 there is now a formula ϕ_n^* of the form (18) such that $\{\phi_1^*, \ldots, \phi_{n-1}^*\} \models \phi_n^*$. By completeness of $\mathcal{C}$, ϕ_n^* is derivable from $\{\phi_1^*, \ldots, \phi_{n-1}^*\}$. The next step is then to derive ϕ_{n-1} from ψ_{n-1}^* as in the validity case. Since this procedure can be repeated for all selections of $\phi_1^*, \ldots, \phi_{n-1}^*$, we conclude by dep E that ϕ_n is derivable from $\{\phi_1, \ldots, \phi_{n-1}\}$ by rules $\mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{M} \cup \mathcal{G}$.

The completeness proofs for QPDL and PDL are analogous and left to the reader. □

7 Conclusion

We have examined the entailment problem for various modal and propositional dependence logics. We showed that the entailment problem for (extended) modal and (quantified) propositional dependence logic is **co-NEXPTIME$^{\mathbf{NP}}$**-complete, and that the corresponding validity problems are **NEXPTIME**-complete. We also showed that modal logic extended with intuitionistic disjunction is **PSPACE**-complete with respect to its satisfiability, validity, and entailment problems. For the validity and entailment problems of quantified propositional independence logic we proved **co-NEXPTIME$^{\mathbf{NP}}$**-completeness, and for the entailment problem of quantified propositional inclusion logic we showed **co-NEXPTIME**-completeness. The same lower bounds apply to the corresponding modal logics. We also gave sound and complete axiomatizations for the entailment and validity problems of extended

modal and (quantified) propositional dependence logic. These axiomatizations are optimal in the sense that they reflect the $\mathbf{co\text{-}NEXPTIME}^{\mathbf{NP}}$ entailment and $\mathbf{NEXPTIME}$ validity algorithms.

It remains an open question to settle the exact complexity of validity and entailment for modal independence and inclusion logic. Solving these questions could also open up possibilities to find novel axiomatic characterizations for the logics.

References

[1] Catriel Beeri and Philip A. Bernstein. Computational problems related to the design of normal form relational schemas. *ACM Trans. Database Syst.*, 4(1):30–59, 1979.

[2] Marco A. Casanova, Ronald Fagin, and Christos H. Papadimitriou. Inclusion dependencies and their interaction with functional dependencies. In *Proceedings of the 1st ACM SIGACT-SIGMOD symposium on Principles of database systems*, PODS '82, pages 171–176, New York, NY, USA, 1982. ACM.

[3] Ashok K. Chandra, Dexter Kozen, and Larry J. Stockmeyer. Alternation. *J. ACM*, 28(1):114–133, 1981.

[4] Stephen A. Cook. The complexity of theorem-proving procedures. In *Proceedings of the 3rd Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, May 3-5, 1971, Shaker Heights, Ohio, USA*, pages 151–158, 1971.

[5] Johannes Ebbing, Lauri Hella, Arne Meier, Julian-Steffen Müller, Jonni Virtema, and Heribert Vollmer. Extended modal dependence logic. In *Logic, Language, Information, and Computation - 20th International Workshop, WoLLIC 2013, Darmstadt, Germany, August 20-23, 2013. Proceedings*, pages 126–137, 2013.

[6] Johannes Ebbing and Peter Lohmann. Complexity of model checking for modal dependence logic. In Mária Bieliková, Gerhard Friedrich, Georg Gottlob, Stefan Katzenbeisser, and György Turán, editors, *SOFSEM 2012: Theory and Practice of Computer Science*, volume 7147 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 226–237. Springer Berlin / Heidelberg, 2012.

[7] Pietro Galliani. Inclusion and exclusion dependencies in team semantics: On some logics of imperfect information. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 163(1):68 – 84, 2012.

[8] Pietro Galliani, Miika Hannula, and Juha Kontinen. Hierarchies in independence logic. In *Computer Science Logic 2013 (CSL 2013)*, volume 23, pages 263–280, 2013.

[9] Erich Grädel and Jouko Väänänen. Dependence and independence. *Studia Logica*, 101(2):399–410, 2013.

[10] Miika Hannula. Axiomatizing first-order consequences in independence logic. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic*, 166(1):61–91, 2015.

[11] Miika Hannula, Juha Kontinen, Martin Lück, and Jonni Virtema. On quantified propositional logics and the exponential time hierarchy. To appear in GandALF 2016, 2016.

[12] Miika Hannula, Juha Kontinen, Jonni Virtema, and Heribert Vollmer. Complexity of propositional independence and inclusion logic. In *Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science 2015 - 40th International Symposium, MFCS 2015, Milan, Italy, August 24-28, 2015, Proceedings, Part I*, pages 269–280, 2015.

[13] Lauri Hella, Antti Kuusisto, Arne Meier, and Jonni Virtema. Model checking and validity in propositional and modal inclusion logics. Manuscript, 2016.

[14] Lauri Hella, Antti Kuusisto, Arne Meier, and Heribert Vollmer. Modal inclusion logic: Being lax is simpler than being strict. In *Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science 2015 - 40th International Symposium, MFCS 2015, Milan, Italy, August 24-28, 2015, Proceedings, Part I*, pages 281–292, 2015.

[15] Lauri Hella, Kerkko Luosto, Katsuhiko Sano, and Jonni Virtema. The expressive power of modal dependence logic. In *Advances in Modal Logic 10, invited and contributed papers from the tenth conference on "Advances in Modal Logic," held in Groningen, The Netherlands, August 5-8, 2014*, pages 294–312, 2014.

[16] Lauri Hella and Johanna Stumpf. The expressive power of modal logic with inclusion atoms. In *Proceedings Sixth International Symposium on Games, Automata, Logics and Formal Verification, GandALF 2015, Genoa, Italy, 21-22nd September 2015.*, pages 129–143, 2015.

[17] Christian Herrmann. On the undecidability of implications between embedded multivalued database dependencies. *Information and Computation*, 122(2):221 – 235, 1995.

[18] Jaakko Hintikka and Gabriel Sandu. Informational independence as a semantic phenomenon. In J.E Fenstad, I.T Frolov, and R. Hilpinen, editors, *Logic, methodology and philosophy of science*, pages 571–589. Elsevier, 1989.

[19] Wilfrid Hodges. Compositional Semantics for a Language of Imperfect Information. *Journal of the Interest Group in Pure and Applied Logics*, 5 (4):539–563, 1997.

[20] Juha Kontinen, Julian-Steffen Müller, Henning Schnoor, and Heribert Vollmer. Modal independence logic. In *Advances in Modal Logic 10, invited and contributed papers from the tenth conference on "Advances in Modal Logic," held in Groningen, The Netherlands, August 5-8, 2014*, pages 353–372, 2014.

[21] Juha Kontinen and Jouko A. Väänänen. Axiomatizing first-order consequences in dependence logic. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic*, 164(11):1101–1117, 2013.

[22] Andreas Krebs, Arne Meier, and Jonni Virtema. A team based variant of CTL. In *22nd International Symposium on Temporal Representation and Reasoning, TIME 2015, Kassel, Germany, September 23-25, 2015*, pages 140–149, 2015.

[23] Richard E. Ladner. The computational complexity of provability in systems of modal propositional logic. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 6(3):467–480, 1977.

[24] Peter Lohmann and Heribert Vollmer. Complexity results for modal dependence logic. *Studia Logica*, 101(2):343–366, 2013.

[25] Martin Lück. Complete problems of propositional logic for the exponential hierarchy. *CoRR*, abs/1602.03050, 2016.

[26] Julian-Steffen Müller and Heribert Vollmer. Model checking for modal dependence logic: An approach through post's lattice. In *Logic, Language, Information, and Computation - 20th International Workshop, WoLLIC 2013, Darmstadt, Germany, August 20-23, 2013. Proceedings*, pages 238–250, 2013.

[27] Gary L. Peterson, John H. Reif, and Salman Azhar. Lower bounds for multiplayer noncooperative games of incomplete information. *Computers & Mathematics with Applications*, 41(7-8):957–992, April 2001.

[28] Katsuhiko Sano and Jonni Virtema. Axiomatizing propositional dependence logics. *CoRR*, abs/1410.5038, 2014.

[29] Merlijn Sevenster. Model-theoretic and computational properties of modal dependence logic. *Journal of Logic and Computation*, 19(6):1157–1173, 2009.

[30] Jouko Väänänen. *Dependence Logic*. Cambridge University Press, 2007.

[31] Jouko Väänänen. Modal Dependence Logic. In Krzysztof R. Apt and Robert van Rooij, editors, *New Perspectives on Games and Interaction*. Amsterdam University Press, Amsterdam, 2008.

[32] Jonni Virtema. Complexity of validity for propositional dependence logics. To appear in *Information and Computation*, 2016.

[33] Fan Yang. Negation and partial axiomatizations of dependence and independence logic revisited. To appear in *WoLLIC 2016*.

[34] Fan Yang. On extensions and variants of dependence logic. PhD thesis, University of Helsinki, 2014.